

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
Bulletin

Volume 35

AUTUMN 1949

Number 3

Editor

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD

Associate Editor

GEORGE POPE SHANNON

Editorial Committee

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

LOUISE POUND

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

RICHARD J. PURCELL

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year. Entered as second-class matter April 24, 1922, at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

RALPH H. LUTZ (*History*) Stanford University

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

JOHN A. KINNEMAN (*Sociology*) Illinois State Normal University

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

MARIE J. WEISS (*Mathematics*) The Tulane University of Louisiana

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Government, Law*) Washington Office

ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

GEORGE POPE SHANNON (*English*) Washington Office

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1947-1949

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Illinois
EARL CRANSTON (<i>Religion, History</i>)	University of Southern California
JAMES HOLLADAY (<i>Banking, Finance</i>)	University of Alabama
O. B. JESNESS (<i>Agricultural Economics</i>)	University of Minnesota
THEODORE KOPPANYI (<i>Pharmacology</i>)	Georgetown University
ARTHUR W. MARTIN, JR. (<i>Physiology</i>)	University of Washington
FRED B. MILLETT (<i>English, Literature</i>)	Wesleyan University
W. ALBERT NOYES, JR. (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Rochester
GEORGE E. POTTER (<i>Zoology</i>)	Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas

1948-1950

WILLIAM RAY DENNES (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of California
MARY JO FINK (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	University of Louisville
J. SUTHERLAND FRAME (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Michigan State College
JAMES A. FUNKHOUSER (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of New Hampshire
JAMES HART (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Virginia
RICHARD HARTSHORNE (<i>Geography</i>)	University of Wisconsin
MABEL NEWCOMER (<i>Economics</i>)	Vassar College
J. RUD NIELSEN (<i>Physics</i>)	University of Oklahoma
CHESLEY J. POSEY (<i>Engineering</i>)	State University of Iowa
GEORGE JARVIS THOMPSON (<i>Law</i>)	Cornell University

1949-1951

MILDRED F. BERRY (<i>Speech</i>)	Rockford College
WILLIAM H. BROWN (<i>Zoology</i>)	University of Arizona
ROBERT LOWRY CALHOUN (<i>Theology</i>)	Yale University
J. WESLEY CHILDERS (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	New York State College for Teachers (Albany)

TOMLINSON FORT (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Georgia
BENTLEY GLASS (<i>Biology</i>)	The Johns Hopkins University
JOSEPH W. INCE (<i>Chemistry</i>)	Rhode Island State College
JOSEPH JAMES IRWIN (<i>English</i>)	Albion College
EDWIN O. STENE (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Kansas
LOWELL O. STEWART (<i>Civil Engineering</i>)	Iowa State College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

W. T. LAPRADE (<i>History</i>)	Duke University
QUINCY WRIGHT (<i>International Law</i>)	University of Chicago
EDWARD C. KIRKLAND (<i>History</i>)	Bowdoin College

CONTENTS

FREEDOM AND FEAR, <i>Zechariah Chafee, Jr.</i>	397
FIRE BELL IN THE NIGHT, <i>Henry M. Wriston</i>	434
THE LITERATURE OF POLITICAL DISILLUSIONMENT, <i>Sidney Hook</i>	450
THE COLLEGES, THE GOVERNMENT AND FREEDOM, <i>Bernard De Voto</i>	468
SOME REFLECTIONS CONCERNING UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, <i>John Dale Russell</i>	476
RONDEAU FOR A FACULTY WIFE, <i>William Leonard Schwartz</i>	489
THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST OF TODAY—A REPLY, <i>William H. Cole</i>	490
THE LABOR GOVERNMENT: AN APPRAISAL, <i>Walter C. Richardson</i>	493
THE STRANGLEHOLD ON EDUCATION—A REPLY, <i>David Donald Malcolm</i>	504
THE BIBLE IN THE COLLEGES, <i>Walter Houston Clark</i>	512
ACADEMICS ANONYMOUS, <i>Joseph Jones</i>	524
EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING, <i>Claude E. Hawley</i>	530
BOOKS AND CULTURAL RECONSTRUCTION, <i>Jaime Torres Bodet</i>	539
CORRESPONDENCE WITH A CHAPTER OFFICER.....	545
REPORT OF THE 1949 NOMINATING COMMITTEE.....	559
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	566
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, WHAT IT IS—WHAT IT DOES.....	567
MEMBERSHIP.....	572
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	590

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Contributors to This Issue

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR. is Langdell Professor of Law, Harvard University.

WALTER HOUSTON CLARK is Associate Professor of Psychology and Education, Middlebury College.

WILLIAM H. COLE is Professor and Chairman of the Department of Physiology and Biochemistry, Rutgers University.

BERNARD DE VOTO is Editor of "The Easy Chair," *Harper's Magazine*. He is a former university teacher (Northwestern and Harvard Universities) and is the author of a number of significant books.

CLAUDE E. HAWLEY is Chief for Social Sciences, Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education.

SIDNEY HOOK is Professor of Philosophy, New York University.

JOSEPH JONES is Associate Professor of English, University of Texas.

DAVID DONALD MALCOLM is Assistant Director, Division of Secondary Education, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

WALTER C. RICHARDSON is Associate Professor of History, Louisiana State University.

JOHN DALE RUSSELL is Director, Division of Higher Education, United States Office of Education.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ is Associate Professor of Romanic Languages, Stanford University.

JAIME TORRES BODET is Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

HENRY M. WRISTON is President of Brown University.

FREEDOM AND FEAR¹

By ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

Harvard University

It is late winter in 1801. For less than six months Washington has been the seat of government of a twelve-year-old union of sixteen states, cooped up within the eastern third of the continent by the Mississippi. Across that river for its entire length and in firm control of its mouth is the most powerful nation on earth, ruled absolutely by one of the greatest of military geniuses, a man of unbounded ambition in command of a gigantic army and a navy not yet sunk at Trafalgar, able to bring troops seasoned in a score of campaigns across the Atlantic through our few vessels to confront only militia when they land on our shores. The country has recently been torn by conflicting ideas and passions engendered by the French Revolution and by a bitter presidential election, which had to be settled by Congress. Now the winner in that contest, a slight man dressed in plain clothes, walks from his lodgings through the muddy and almost houseless streets, without a guard or servant. He reaches the Capitol, an embryonic structure with one wing and no dome. Attended only by a crowd of citizens, he ascends the steps to become the third President of the United States, and before long is speaking these words:

If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know indeed that some honest men have feared that a republican government cannot be strong; that this government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm on the theoretic and visionary fear that this government, the world's best hope, may, by possibility, want energy to preserve itself? I trust

¹ Address delivered at the annual literary exercises of the Harvard University Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, June 20, 1949.

not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth.

It is late winter in 1949. The sixteen states have trebled and the five million citizens of 1801 have multiplied in 148 years to well nigh 148 millions, filling the natural boundaries which the United States attained a century ago. Our only neighbors now are two peaceful and friendly nations, and our people are the most prosperous in the world. Indeed, we are the only large country which is prosperous at all, for the rest are impoverished, devastated, struggling in austerity. The thirty-second President, Harry S. Truman, is sworn in before more than 100,000 of his fellow-countrymen and honored by the greatest parade in the long history of the national Capital, watched by a million persons. The pageant passes before the reviewing stand for almost three hours, beginning with the scarlet-coated United States Marine Band. There are the men from West Point and Annapolis, marching in their famous precision. There are General Eisenhower and General Bradley, Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Halsey. An armada of airplanes roars above. And these are only a small portion of our armed forces which have exterminated a despot ruling a vaster territory than Napoleon, fought two mighty enemies at the same time, and reduced them to ruin. Millions of other Americans trained and hardened in warfare are ready to take up arms again at a moment's notice should any foe threaten attack. Nor is this all, for the scientists whom Jefferson encouraged have handed on their patient and resourceful skill to many more scientists, who have given this nation the most deadly weapon ever wielded by man.

Once again the national spirit of the moment is voiced in words. This time it is not by the newly-elected President, but by three Senators who are inserting in bills, which they will introduce in Congress in a month, the basic political theme of 1949:

The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the

common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

II

This "appropriate legislation," built around the prevailing national principle of fear and announced as "necessary to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation," will be my subject today. It consists of two sedition bills to replace the Mundt-Nixon Bill of last year, which passed the House of Representatives by a big margin and faded away in the Senate. This year the bills start in the Senate with bright prospects of a favorable committee report and, very possibly, a majority vote on the floor. One bill is introduced by Senator Ferguson of Michigan. The other is again the work of Senator Mundt of South Dakota, formerly prominent in the Un-American Committee of the House, with the help of Senator Johnston of South Carolina. Since these two measures are almost identical, I shall concentrate on the Mundt-Johnston Bill—the Mundt Bill for short.

Details of this bill will become familiar to you as I go along, but its main features need to be briefly stated right away, so that you will know what I am talking about.

This new sedition bill covers 35 pages—846 lines of sizable type. It starts with a long preamble, from which I have already quoted, in which Congress, on the basis of evidence adduced before the Un-American Committee and other committees, undertakes the novel task of writing contemporary history in a statute. After this somewhat simplified history of the "world Communist movement" and its local manifestations, the bill creates an entirely new political crime punishable by ten years in prison (to be discussed later). Then it embarks on its main job of setting up an elaborate system for registration and public disclosure for groups and to some extent for individuals, whenever these are ruled to be linked with the world Communist movement.

The central feature of the scheme is a Subversive Activities Commission of three men. This is empowered to classify two

different types of objectionable groups and order them to register.

The first type consists of "Communist political organizations." This is defined as any organization having some of the usual characteristics of a political party, which (a) is dominated by the foreign government or political organization controlling the world Communist movement, and (b) operates primarily to advance the objectives of that movement.

If the Commission puts any organization into this class and the organization obeys the order to register, it has to file then and every year a list of all its members and their addresses and a full financial report, which is to be open for public inspection and printed in a public document. A person mistakenly put on the membership list is allowed to persuade the Commission to strike his name off. Conversely, if a member is wrongly omitted, he can be ordered to register all by himself. Once an organization is registered or ordered to register, every member is ineligible to hold an appointive federal office or apply for a passport. If he runs for election, he must not conceal his membership. All publications involving the organization (including letters) must not be sent by mail (or in any way across state lines) without stating outside and inside that they come from "a Communist organization." Any radio broadcasts caused by such a group must make a similar announcement.

On the other hand, if the proscribed organization or an unlisted member fails to register or reports untruthfully, a criminal prosecution can take place. On conviction, the minimum penalty is two years in prison or a \$2000 fine, or both. Every day that registration is postponed, every name left off the list, every willfully false statement, is a separate offense carrying this minimum penalty.

The second type of groups reached by the bill are "Communist-front organizations," which are defined to include any organization which (a) is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (b) is primarily operated to give aid and support to such an organization or to a Communist foreign government, or to the world Communist movement. Here only a list of officers is required, not of members, and there is no ineligibility for federal officeholding or passports. Otherwise the penalties are about the same as for a Communist political organization, including publicity

of reports, supervised records, and the labeling of mail, etc., as emanating from "a Communist organization."

There is an old story of a liberated slave who met his former master on the street. The master asked, "Are you as well off as before you were free?" The Negro admitted that his clothes were frayed, his house leaked, and his meals were nothing like the food on the old plantation. "Well, wouldn't you rather be a slave again?" "No, massa. There's a sort of a looseness about this here freedom that I likes."

There is no looseness about this bill. It is drafted with amazing efficiency. It reminds me of the efficiency of a Ukranian law for straitjacketing presses and publications which was read to us a year ago at the Geneva Conference on Human Rights.

III

My main objection to this bill is that I see very little evidence to support the recital that the world Communist movement presents "a clear and present danger . . . to the existence of free American institutions." Let me begin by reviewing the acts of Congress which now protect our government and institutions from attacks through violence or other unlawful action.

First, a statute enacted in 1861 punishes conspiracy "to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States," or forcibly hinder the execution of any federal law. This was thought adequate to protect the government when the Confederate Army was within 100 miles of Washington. Another statute of 1867 punishes conspiracy to commit an offense against the government with any overt act, no force being required. These two statutes kept us safe from any serious consequences of internal disaffection through the Panic of 1873, the Panic of 1893, the Panic of 1907, and the Great Depression of 1929-1933.

Still, in 1940 Congress wanted more than the old conspiracy statutes. So it created two new types of criminal offenses. To begin with, it made the Espionage Act of 1917 applicable in time of peace, so as to punish anybody who advocated insubordination or disloyalty in the armed forces. This measure was urged as

essential to protect the Army and Navy from Communist organizations. Yet the only reported case under it was the abortive prosecution of about thirty Fascists and anti-Semites in Washington in 1944.

The other 1940 statute, commonly called the Smith Act, makes it a serious crime to advocate the overthrow of any government in the United States by force, or to be an organizer or a member of any group of persons which advocates such overthrow. This is the first federal peacetime sedition law since the ill-fated Sedition Act of 1798. It goes very far toward reaching anybody who belongs to what the new bill defines as a "Communist political organization." If there were really a clear and present danger in this country from world-wide Communism, anybody would naturally expect that this Smith Act would have been invoked again and again during recent years. On the contrary we find just three prosecutions. The first was back in 1943 against a small outlaw labor union in Minneapolis. Being Trotskyites, they were about as far removed as possible from the Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union. The second was the abortive Washington prosecution of Fascists, already mentioned. Surely, Stalin's influence over American citizens could not have created an overwhelming peril to our nation when the Smith Act lay dormant for eight years before any of Stalin's admirers were thought worth prosecuting.

At last, eleven leaders of the Communist Party of America were indicted. Their trial is now going on in New York City. The government's case has been completed, so that we can get a pretty good idea already whether these eleven men and their organization have our country in deadly danger. There has certainly been some very obnoxious behavior by the defendants in the courtroom and the witnesses for the prosecution have recounted some pretty objectionable talk at the various Communist meetings which they attended. Yet, whatever the outcome of this case, is there anything in the government's evidence to scare any American citizen of normal intestinal fortitude? I have talked with scores of people of varying political and economic views while this testimony was going on. Only two or three of them even brought up the case in conversation. Nobody was the least bit scared. Nor have I happened to see alarm expressed by a single editorial or a single

letter to the editor of a newspaper. It is about the least exciting news of the day.

The low temperature of this trial is significantly indicated by the accounts of the government's case in the *New York Times*. For fourteen successive days, the trial wandered around the inner pages of the *Times*. It was front-page news for a little less than half the time. This is hardly the way the chief newspaper in the country behaves when the nation is at death's door. Possibly these eleven men or some of them will be properly found guilty, but is anybody lying awake at night a single minute from terror because of the testimony against them?

Some have argued that Communist spies make a new statute necessary. Yet I know of no trials connected with spying for many years, until the two now going on. No matter how Mr. Hiss's case ends, the documents in question are ten years old. Much better precautions against leakage now exist in government offices. And the Nation seems to have survived the extensive leakage of 1938 documents without the slightest sign of any resulting calamity. At all events there is no reason to suppose that this bill will stop all spying. Anybody who is wicked enough to be a spy and hardy enough to brave the severe penalties of the Espionage Act will not be bothered about evading a statute requiring him to register as a Communist.

One provision in this bill punishes acts of disclosing secret information to members of Communist and Communist-front organizations. Why hide a government secret only from Communists and let it out to Fascists, columnists, and ladies at large? This country contains many more blabbers than conspirators. If the present statutes against spying are defective, the proper remedy lies in new legislation aimed directly at spying, and not in roaming all over the lot against thousands of people, most of whom would never dream of being spies.

The postal provisions of this bill are unnecessary to prevent the transmission of really dangerous communications, because existing statutes make matter non-mailable for violating the Espionage Act or advocating treason, insurrection, forcible resistance to a law of the United States, arson, murder, or assassination, deny

the second-class mailing privilege to such matter, make imported books, etc., of this sort seizable in the customs.

Finally, in connection with the registration provisions in the bill, it is important to observe that we now have two statutes which require registration by anybody who acts as the agent of a foreign government (except diplomats, consuls, etc.), and by any organization "subject to foreign control" if it is engaged in political activity or if it aims to control, seize, or overthrow the government of the United States by force. Whoever fails to register before acting incurs severe criminal penalties. Now, if the Communist Party of America or any other group in this country really satisfies Senator Mundt's definition of a "Communist political organization," then he doesn't need any new law to make it register. It can be compelled to do so any day under the existing statutes just mentioned. The fact that these two statutes have not been enforced against the Communist Party or its leaders indicates that all the talk in the pending bills about American communists creating "a clear and present danger" of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States, is like the reports of Mark Twain's death—grossly exaggerated.

To sum up in two sentences this survey of the present United States Code:

If American Communists and fellow-travellers are as dangerous as the supporters of these bills make out, then there is enough legislation already with teeth in it to take care of these people; so no new law is needed.

If, on the contrary, existing statutes are not violated by what these people are saying or doing, then they can't be very dangerous; so no new law is needed.

IV

Let us now turn from the law to the facts. How many Communists are there in the United States? No more, probably, than thirty years ago when they left the Socialist Party. The United Press said 70,000 in 1947, out of a total population of 143,382,000. Thus Communists form 1/20 of 1% of all the people in our country. The odds are 1999 to 1 in favor of free institutions.

Suppose the Harvard stadium filled with 40,000 people. The chances are that 20 of them would be Communists and 39,980 would not. Remember, too, that it is not a question of 20 dynamiters or 20 men with concealed weapons, for then they could be arrested at once under the ordinary criminal laws. Just 20 unarmed persons who have not violated any existing federal or state law or conspired to violate any existing law. But they have learned bad ideas about politics from foreigners and foreign books, they are thinking bad thoughts about these bad ideas, they are telling them to each other and to any outsiders who are willing to listen. What can we do to prevent them from harming the other 99.95 per cent of us, who have on our side only the city and state police, almost every newspaper and school teacher and professor and preacher, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, never forgetting the Marines?

Such is the "clear and present danger" *inside the United States* which (according to this bill) imperils "the existence of free institutions" and makes it "necessary" for Congress to pass a new law thirty-five pages long with unheard of regulations and ten-year prison sentences "in order . . . to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation." Shades of Valley Forge and Iwo Jima! If we no longer want to be the land of the free, at least let us be the home of the brave.

I fully recognize that the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia was a danger to the freedom of Czechoslovakia, and the same is probably true of Italy and some other countries. It does not follow that the inclusion of less than 1/20 of 1% of our population in a Communist Party here is a real danger to our institutions and our freedom under the very different conditions in this country. We have a very strong government equipped with existing legislation and efficient federal police. Our government does not need any such novel bill as this in order to deal effectively with any actual conspiracy against its existence or any actual effort toward violent revolution. Where *inside this country* are the facts which justify the establishment of unheard of regulatory machinery, the expenditure of large sums of money in its operation and the severe punishment of American citizens because somebody or other has not filled out a piece of paper?

It is now nearly thirty years since my work as a student of freedom of speech led me to pay considerable attention to the activities of Communists in this country. Although I still dislike them very much, it is my considered opinion that they are far less dangerous today than they were in 1919-20, soon after the Russian Revolution. During those early years that revolution was to many Americans the symbol of a better world. It was assumed to be a heaven on earth. To many idealists it at last appeared possible that men might build a fruitful society without having to seek their own profit. Few of those who now dream of a city of God can ignore the ugly facts in Moscow. Radicals of my acquaintance who used to speak of Russia as a land of hope are now reduced to saying that it is no worse than any other country. Also social and economic conditions in this country have vastly improved since 1919. The reasons for revolutionary discontent which then existed have greatly been lessened by the legislation under Mr. Roosevelt, the high wages paid during the war and since, the realization that Americans of every sort fought and suffered side by side during the war. The spiritual health of the nation is far better than in 1919. We have a much greater immunity to revolutionary radicalism.

V

Sometimes I wonder whether the supporters of measures like these bills have been worrying so much about Communists that they have forgotten what freedom-loving Americans are like. They are the last people to fall easy victims to the ideology of a country where nobody can speak his own mind unless he agrees with the ruling class, where there is only one party convention and only one man to vote for at an election, where labor unions are state-run bureaus, where men can be grabbed out of their beds in the dead of night with no charge against them and be hidden away from their families for weeks, where hordes of people are moved from their old homes at the will of some official and ordered to live and work in some barren place two thousand miles away. Although communism now has behind it a powerful nation, which was not the case thirty years ago, this makes military problems

more serious but I believe it decreases whatever attraction it has had for American citizens. If there is one thing American history teaches, it is that most of our citizens intensely detest any possible foreign influences over our own political policies. The very fact that joining the Communist Party means constantly taking sides with a foreign government against our own government is enough to keep most American radicals from having anything to do with that party. And then there are more material considerations, though by no means sordid. Think of the billions of dollars invested in life insurance and savings banks, the pride a man has in knowing that he is giving his children a better start in life than he had himself, the satisfaction of acquiring a home, a car, a motor boat, a little cottage on the beach. These bulwarks against communism are infinitely stronger than all the inquisitions and prosecutions that could ever be devised.

The only possibility of Communistic control of this country, leaving aside the chance of foreign conquest, would come, I believe, from the destruction of this confidence which the great mass of our citizens now have in their own future and that of their children and their community. Imagine a prolonged period of enormous unemployment; the dollar buying what a dime buys now, and perhaps worth a nickel next week, who knows; ever-mounting taxes; the national revenue heavily mortgaged for decades by unwise commitments to groups of the aged at the expense of active men and women and their children; voters hating and despising the men they themselves have put in office because they had nobody better to choose from. That is when communism might grow by leaps and bounds, not because of what 70,000 Communists say but because of what the hopeless facts say. Maggots live in rotten meat.

A friend of mine met a Communist in France. He was a man of considerable wealth, and my surprised friend asked him, "Then why on earth are you a Communist?" "Because *any* government is better than the kind we have been having for years and years." It is that sort of spirit which, if it should be widespread in this country, might lead us into communism.

It is up to the gentlemen in the Senate and the House of Representatives to make sure that no such blinding discouragement and

financial demoralization shall ever threaten us. Better yet, it lies in their power to do many things which will constantly lessen disaffection and strengthen the confidence of citizens in the future and in their institutions. The cure for internal disaffection is not sedition bills, but all sorts of statutes within the normal tasks of the Congress and the state legislatures. The safeguard against communism and any other sort of loyalty is to make this steadily a better country to live in.

VI

A further objection to this pending bill is that, while it purports to be necessary to preserve "free American institutions," it gravely impairs some of the most precious of those institutions, freedom of speech and press and assembly, which our ancestors put at the very head of our Bill of Rights. Without bothering you with an extensive discussion of the meaning of those freedoms, I merely point out that the American tradition of freedom of speech and press and assembly is that words as such shall not be punished or restricted, however objectionable the ideas they express. Peaceable language should be left alone by law, for the proper remedy for it is peaceable language on the other side. An especially strong claim to immunity is possessed by speeches and publications concerning political issues and candidates for office, because they are an essential part of the process of self-government. The only words which may properly be made unlawful are either (1) immediately injurious like libel and obscenity, or (2) closely connected with commonly recognized wrongful acts, e. g., an incitement to murder or to desert from the armed forces.

Now, there is no limitation in the Mundt Bill to the two exceptional situations just mentioned. For instance, the passport section keeps a man within this country because of his association with men of specified political views, with no consideration of his own unfitness to travel abroad and with no reference to any unlawful act. The denial of a passport may amount to a severe penalty on a person with *bona fide* reasons for going abroad. All the registration provisions relating to a "Communist political organization" restrict normal political processes without regard to

any unlawful act. The registration provisions for "Communist-front organizations" have no relation to any unlawful act, but are imposed because of the expression and exchange of opinions. The burdens on the use of the mails for letters as well as printed matter have no relation to any unlawful acts or to the character of the language sent by mail.

In case any of you happen to think that the pending trial of Communist leaders in New York shows sufficient unlawful acts to take them and the Communist Party of America outside the traditional protection for freedom of speech, I would respectfully direct your attention to the fact that this bill is not limited in its application to that particular party. For example, if there had been such a law passed a year ago, the Progressive Party headed by a former Vice-President of the United States might, for all we know, have been ruled to be a "Communist political organization," and the same thing may happen in 1952 if either bill be enacted. Moreover, the "Communist-front" provisions obviously extend to other organizations than the Communist Party of America. It is impossible to justify the sweeping provisions of this bill by saying that it reaches only particular groups who don't deserve to have any freedoms anyway. You never know whom a sedition bill is going to hit until the authorities start shooting with it.

So the provisions just summarized and many others in this bill should be placed alongside the following selected statements by four exponents of the American tradition of freedom of speech and press and assembly, two of them great Democrats, two others great Republicans.

You have already heard what Thomas Jefferson said in his First Inaugural in 1801, during the apprehensions caused by the French Revolution, but I repeat the sentence, hoping none of you will ever forget it:

If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Justice Holmes said in a famous dissenting opinion in 1919 during

the period of great excitement about Russians in this country who ardently supported the Russian Revolution:

But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that the truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That at any rate is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year if not every day we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country . . . Only the emergency that makes it immediately dangerous to leave the correction of evil counsels to time warrants making any exception to the sweeping command, "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech."

A few months later, Charles Evans Hughes objected to the refusal of seats in the New York Assembly to five duly elected Socialists, who were considerably less radical than Communists. That imitation of Pride's Purge was closely parallel to this bill, for although it does not actually bar Communists from being candidates for elective office, the burdensome registration provisions and the possibility of prosecutions will make it very difficult for any member of a "Communist political organization," and probably a "Communist-front organization," to participate in normal political processes. So Hughes' condemnation of any proposal to disenfranchise men merely for belonging to a group is highly relevant to the bills you are considering:

If there was anything against these men as individuals, if they were deemed to be guilty of criminal offenses, they should have been charged accordingly. But I understand that the action is not directed against these five elected members as individuals but that the proceeding is virtually an attempt to indict a political party

and to deny it representation in the Legislature. This is not, in my judgment, American government. . . .

I understand that it is said that the Socialists constitute a combination to overthrow the Government. The answer is plain. If public officers or private citizens have any evidence that any individuals, or groups of individuals, are plotting revolution and seeking by violent measures to change our Government, let the evidence be laid before the proper authorities and swift action be taken for the protection of the community. Let every resource of inquiry, of pursuit, of prosecution be employed to ferret out and punish the guilty according to our laws. But I count it a most serious mistake to proceed, not against individuals charged with violation of law, but against masses of our citizens combined for political action, by denying them the only resource of peaceful government; that is, action by the ballot box and through duly elected representatives in legislative bodies.

Finally, Alfred E. Smith spoke out against the expulsion of the Socialist Assemblymen:

Our faith in American democracy is confirmed not only by its results, but by its methods and organs of free expression. They are the safeguards against revolution. To discard the methods of representative government leads to the misdeeds of the very extremists we denounce—and serves to increase the number of the enemies of orderly free government.

These are four of the men who did most to make "free American institutions" what they are today. Read the Mundt Bill for yourself and see how far it departs from the principles cherished and declared by Jefferson, Holmes, Hughes, and Al Smith.

VII

My next objection is drawn from the past experience of the Nation. This is not the first time when fear of the infiltration of revolutionary radicalism from Europe has led earnest men to demand drastic laws against speeches and publications. A hundred and fifty years ago patriots terrified of the French Revolution got Congress to enact the Sedition Act of 1798. It is commonly regarded as one of the greatest follies in our history. Again, after the First World War, Congress was repeatedly urged to pass a new

peacetime sedition law. Revolutionary groups were much more vocal than now. Violent acts occurred like a bomb exploded near the house of the Attorney General. Still, Congress refused to do anything, and nobody now regrets that refusal. The years that followed proved that the law which eminent men said was indispensable to save the country was not needed at all. The names of the men who supported the bills of 1798 and 1919-20 have long ago slipped into oblivion, but we remember Jefferson, Holmes, Hughes, and Al Smith for their courageous insistence that we must trust open discussion to bring us safely through.

That courage, we are now told by proponents of a bill like this, is out of date. The United States never had to face Stalin before. But in 1798-1801 it had to face the French Revolution and Napoleon. And in 1919-20 it had to face Lenin. His army was not so big as Stalin's, but he was a far abler master of revolutionary tactics. The lawyers who drafted the Sedition Act of 1798 and the judges who enforced that law were firmly convinced that they were stamping out a foreign menace fully as dangerous as the foreign menace which confronts us today. Indeed, they used much the same arguments as those urged for this bill now, with France the villain instead of Russia and Switzerland replacing Czechoslovakia as the victim to forecast the fate of our own republic if we do not save ourselves by passing a sedition law.

Listen to the dire prophecies with which, in 1799, a committee of the House of Representatives urged the continuance of the Sedition Act for two years more:

If it be asserted . . . that our security arises from the form of our Constitution, let Switzerland, first divided and disarmed by perfidious seductions, now agonized by relentless power, illustrate the consequences of similar credulity. . .

France appears to have an organized system of conduct toward foreign nations; to bring them within the sphere, and under the dominion of her influence and control. It has been unremittingly pursued under all the changes of her internal policy. Her means are in wonderful coincidence with her ends; among these, and not the least successful, is the direction and employment of the active and versatile talents of her citizens abroad as emissaries and spies.

As late as January, 1801, after the Federalists had lost the

presidency, one of them was still trying to get the House to prolong the statute, by charging French agents with buying several American newspapers with foreign money for the purpose of spreading disaffection.

In 1919-20 you can find the same kind of fears as today eloquently expressed in House and Senate Hearings. Thus Attorney General Palmer said of the left-wing pamphlets he wanted Congress to suppress:

The continual spread of the seeds of evil thought, the continual inoculation of poison virus of social sedition, poisonous to every fiber and root, to every bone and sinew, to the very heart and soul of all that by our standards is integrity in citizenship or personal character cannot help but foster frightfully the revolutionary disease. Is there no . . . Government policy . . . that can stand effectively for social sanitation?

In the New York Assembly the Outline of the case against the five Socialists described their party as "having the single purpose of destroying our institutions and government and substituting the Russian-Soviet government, . . . an anti-national party whose allegiance is given to the Internationale and not to the United States."

Everybody agrees now that these fears of subversive organizations in 1798-1801 and 1919-20 were much exaggerated. Probably this is just as true of the fears expressed today by the supporters of the Mundt Bill. Its solemn assertion of its necessity "to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation" will sound as queer in the future as the passages I have been quoting.

Every great war, especially a war accompanied by revolutions, is followed by a difficult settling-down period. The anxieties and strains of war do not die out the moment hostilities stop. People go on being worried because they have been worried so long, and all sorts of economic and social adjustments caused by the dislocations of war bring new reasons for anxiety. It took over ten years for us to get back to normal after our own Civil War. The constant tension breaks out in all sorts of queer ways, and one frequent manifestation of it is fear of internal disaffection. The

English went through a terrible period of this sort after the long Napoleonic Wars; they enacted any number of suppressive statutes, and soldiers shot down workmen who were attending a peaceful meeting at Peterloo. We experienced the same kind of thing in a milder form after the First World War during the so-called "Red Menace." In such times of disturbance and anxiety, sedition laws were demanded as indispensable, but soon the tension began to relax, the fears proved unwarranted, and the country went on safely with its traditional freedoms.

We are going through such a settling-down process today. It is particularly difficult for all sorts of causes—the magnitude of the devastation, the delay in the peace treaties, the diverse character of the victorious nations, the unprecedented formation of a worldwide permanent union, and so on. We have plenty of real worries, and it is quite natural that they should be reflected in some false worries as well. All the more reason for keeping our heads.

It is like waking up at two in the morning and trying to solve all your problems at once. A wise man tells himself that some of those problems won't amount to much in daylight. He faces the immediate tangible tasks squarely, and stops tearing himself to pieces over vague, remote, conspiratorial perils. Usually they vanish next morning. If not, they shrink into concrete problems which can be taken up when they actually arise as part of the ordinary course of life.

We may be getting well along in this uneasy settling-down process by now. Relations with the Soviet Union are noticeably less strained than when these bills were introduced late in February. Many delicate negotiations with the Russians are under way. This is a poor time to outlaw Communists when we have some real hopes of doing business with the Kremlin. What harm will it do to wait and see how things work out?

I have read a good many regrets that particular sedition laws were passed. Never, given the lapse of two or three years, have I known anybody to regret that a sedition law was rejected.

The principles which Jefferson used to allay apprehensions in his time are equally valid in our time. Meet unlawful action with action; proceed against real spies and real plotters as he prosecuted Aaron Burr and approved the dismissal of Genet. Meet objec

tionable ideas from abroad by living up to our own ideas—give increased drawing-power to our great traditions of democracy and freedom.

VIII

My final point before I take up the Mundt Bill in detail is very important. Its enactment would disastrously impair our influence over other freedom-loving peoples.

If we leave aside military considerations, the best way to combat the spread of communism in Western Europe and elsewhere is to give increased drawing-power to the great traditions of democracy and freedom. These war-torn countries want more than weapons, more than food and machinery. They are eager for ideals to strengthen the spirit and make life worth living. Communism, we are told, operates like a religion; it is presented as the vision of a better world. Yet Jefferson and Lincoln had a great vision. During the nineteenth century it possessed the appeal of a religion to bring millions to our shores. In order to hearten the discouraged peoples of the twentieth century, we must keep that vision bright—not, this time, to attract them to America but to enable them to rebuild their lives in their own homes, so that the freedom which Jefferson and Lincoln did so much to give us will be a reality in many parts of the world.

More than words is needed. Unless our acts show that we believe in our democratic ideals, we lessen the chance of winning wavering men to democracy.

In my experience with foreigners in the United Nations, I have been constantly impressed by the way our prevailing adherence to the ideals of our Bill of Rights helps to close up the ranks of freedom-loving countries in opposition to undesirable measures. On the other hand, I have seen how much harm is done whenever we conspicuously depart from our professed basic principles. It lays us open to damaging charges of hypocrisy and pretense, which are hard to meet. There is no doubt that such attacks based on concrete facts do impress men from many countries whose support we need, and sometimes they are thus pried apart from the U. S. delegation on critical votes.

Now, freedom of information is one of the big issues in the United Nations at the present time. A treaty of great value to facilitate the work of foreign correspondents, which was originally projected by our State Department, has been put in final form by the General Assembly. Over and above this, freedom of speech and press is an American ideal which means a very great deal to the citizens of countries where censorship and every sort of gross suppression have prevailed in recent years. So the way we maintain freedom of speech and press or the way we depart from it is bound to have a tremendous effect, for good or bad, upon delegates from countries like Holland, Norway, India, and Australia.

Consequently, if we enact a new sedition law like either of these bills, it will do us great harm among our natural friends in the United Nations. They know well how much suppression is made possible by the vague definitions in these bills. We just can't defend such a sedition law against the bitter attacks of our opponents, and still less against the distrust of our friends. Our professions of love for open discussion will ring hollow in their ears. And matters will be much worse when enforcement starts, with numerous inquisitions by the Subversive Activities Commission, mail opened, non-registrants prosecuted, lists gone through with a fine-toothed comb, and all the rest of it. Frenchmen, Belgians, Dutchmen, Norwegians, Danes have had years of experience with that sort of thing under totalitarian occupations and it leaves a stench in their nostrils.

Your countrymen who could have hurled
Their freedom like a brand
Have cupped it to a candle spark
In a frightened hand.

The way for us to spread abroad freedom of speech is to live up to it ourselves.

IX

It is time to examine the Mundt Bill in some detail and see how it will work. The abstract idea of making Communists disclose themselves seems harmless. A year ago last February the

American Bar Association endorsed this idea, voting in a vacuum with no specific provisions before it:

It is recommended . . . that Communists and Communist organizations should be compelled to register, giving complete information as to their activity, purposes, financing, source of funds, affiliation, membership and like matters.

Very pretty indeed. But once you actually start on this course, where do you eventually land?

1. *The new political crime.* The Mundt Bill is much more than a registration measure, although it is sometimes represented to be merely that. Section 4 has no connection with the registration requirements. It punishes any sort of participation in the novel and very vague crime of "facilitating or aiding in the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship" in the United States. Whatever this crime means, it goes far beyond the speech which is punishable under the Smith Act. The statute of limitations does not apply, so that a mature man can be punished for what he did as a college student. Yet all sorts of very wicked crimes have some limit on the possibility of prosecution. There is something barbarous about classing this vague and entirely novel offense with capital crimes like murder and treason.

Nobody knows how unexpectedly a sedition law can be construed unless he has studied into such matters. The draftsman and the legislators have certain particular situations in mind, but its actual use may be against some kind of conduct which they never dreamed of. Thus a New York statute which was passed after the assassination of President McKinley to punish anarchists has never been used against an anarchist, but it was drastically enforced against Gitlow and other Communists, who are at the opposite pole of political thought from anarchists. A still more striking illustration is a federal statute, which punishes with imprisonment up to five years a willful "threat to take the life of the President. . ." What could be plainer? At once we think of the need of shutting up the man who writes the President that he will be shot unless a certain bill is vetoed. But that is not the way this statute has worked out. A man in Beaumont, Texas,

got into a violent argument about Wilson's war policies and exclaimed "I wish Wilson was in hell, and if I had the power I would put him there." He was convicted under this law, and the appellate judges held his revolting language was punishable as a threat to kill the President, because how could he be in hell unless he were dead?

So, if this bill passes, you cannot tell what sort of people will ever be punished for agreeing to aid in establishing a totalitarian dictatorship, but you can be sure that they will be very different people from anybody that you have in mind in the summer of 1949.

I have already pointed out that these provisions do not involve any use of force or unlawful acts. It will be a crime for two men to agree that one of them will run for Congress on a platform which a particular jury considers to involve a totalitarian dictatorship.

A further serious difficulty about section 4 arises from the fact that it probably overlaps the definition of a "Communist political organization," which has to register under this bill. Therefore, any active participant in a "Communist political organization" is guilty of the vague crime which is punishable under section 4. In other words, the registration provisions virtually compel them to confess their own guilt of aiding to establish a totalitarian dictatorship. Thus, besides impairing the policy of freedom of speech under the First Amendment, the bill cuts into the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment.

Section 4 of the Mundt Bill is a straight sedition law of the most reprehensible sort. We came through the months between the fall of France and Pearl Harbor without needing any such protection against the much more powerful totalitarian dictatorship of Hitler, and we certainly do not need any such extraordinary statute now.

2. *The general registration machinery.* We can expect that if the bill becomes law, the procedure will operate in three successive stages:

First. Some organizations may register voluntarily or may do so after receiving some sort of notice that a proceeding for registration is to be begun. Some individuals not listed by the organization to which they belong may also register of their own accord.

Second. Contested cases will be heard and decided by the Subversive Activities Commission, to which I shall return in a moment.

Third. Either the government or an organization (or individual) required by the Commission to register may get judicial review in the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, and perhaps in the Supreme Court if it is willing to bother with the case.

It is my well considered opinion that by far the most important of these three stages is the second stage, before the Commission. Except for the purposes of passing on questions of constitutionality, judicial review may not play an important part for at least two reasons. In the first place, going to court is expensive and the financial resources of organizations under fire will often be small anyway; they will be further crippled by the denial of income tax advantages under this bill which is likely to scare off contributors as soon as proceedings start against an organization, without waiting for the final order. In the second place all the evidence against an organization or on its behalf will be taken before the Commission. The reviewing court has no power to receive any new evidence. Now, any lawyer knows that the way in which testimony shapes up depends considerably upon the competence, experience, and fairness of the person or persons presiding at the trial.

Therefore the operation of this statute depends very largely on the three persons composing the Subversive Activities Commission. Who are they, what will be their experience, are there any safeguards to induce them to behave like judges rather than law-enforcers and policy-makers, are they independent of executive control or Congressional control, does the compensation attract men of unusual ability?

To any person familiar with the proceedings of administrative bodies, the answers which the bill furnishes to such questions as these is nothing short of astonishing. The bill states no qualifications whatever except that the three members are to be appointed by the President, one from the State Department, one from the Commerce Department, and one from the National Military Establishment. It is not certain whether they have to be confirmed by the Senate. There is nothing about length of service.

Hence they can doubtless be removed at will, and what is worse, there is no assurance whatever of continuity of service through which men gain ripe judgment in the performance of difficult duties. So far as the bill shows, one underling after another may be shoved into this Commission for such time as he can spare from his normal work. If any decision he makes does not satisfy his superiors, off he goes. Surely this is not the way to encourage competent and impartial decisions in a novel and very controversial field.

Especially disturbing is the provision that one of these three men is to come from the Military Establishment. A general or an admiral in uniform can be empowered to tell civilians what political parties they ought not to join and what other organizations of civilians are to exist under crippling burdens. Did I say a general or an admiral? It may very well be a major or a lieutenant, s.g., for all the bill says. Such a military man may easily come to dominate the Commission and shape its decisions according to the wishes of those who control the armed forces. Thus an important part of the exchange of political views among citizens can be shaped by the military. This conception of "free institutions" would have staggered the men who drafted our Constitution at Philadelphia in 1787.

The Ferguson Bill removes some of these difficulties by providing for a salary of \$12,500, a term of three years, nonremoval except for cause, and confirmation by the Senate. There is no characterization of members as in the other bill, and I hope the Senate would not confirm a member of the armed forces for this judicial task.

However, the Ferguson Bill has a bad snag of its own. The three members of the Commission "shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment." What sort of men will be willing to do nothing except examine the affairs of suspected subversive organizations, all day long, week in and week out, for three years? Sifting the good from the bad requires historical and sociological training and insight plus judicial capacity of a high order, but there is none of the variety which makes a judge's work appealing. The danger is that nobody who is really fit for this task will touch it with a ten-foot pole. What you are likely to

get is either political hacks attracted by one of the highest-paid jobs in government service, or else persons fired by a zeal to save the country from communism.

Tremendous powers over the lives of private citizens will be possessed, under either bill, by the three men on this Commission. They can shape political action, blast reputations, make government employees and workmen lose their jobs with small hope of getting other employment. Even if organizations condemned by the Commission get judicial review, the courts will not have much of a chance to reverse its decision. On the assumption that these bills are constitutional, their definitions of a "Communist political organization" and a "Communist-front organization" are so wide that it will be hard for judges to say that the Commission was wrong in bringing an organization within those definitions. The judges may be reluctant to substitute their own judgment in face of the judgment of the officials.

Only a terrible danger to the nation could justify Congress in placing these enormous powers in the hands of three men who do not have the training and experience of judges or the life-tenure which the Constitution considers essential to assure the independence of men who make vital decisions. Does such a terrible danger really exist?

3. *The registration of "Communist political organizations."* Perhaps something can be said for requiring all political parties and all organizations which are somehow associated with politics to register, but these bills do nothing like that. They impose on particular political parties or organizations very serious burdens from which other political parties, etc., are wholly free. The Mundt Bill requires some but not all parties to file the names and addresses of all members (perhaps 70,000 for the Communist Party), to repeat this full list every year, to keep all sorts of accurate records. And every omitted name or address, every inaccuracy, may mean two years in prison for the party officers. Imagine what this would mean if it had to be done by the Republican Party or the Democratic Party!

But those are good parties, the supporters of the bill may say, and the bill hits only bad parties. By the American tradition, sifting bad parties from good parties is the job of the voters, and

not the job of Congress or government officials. We have had confidence that most of the voters would recognize a bad party when they saw it and keep away from it. The fate of the Know-Nothing Party, which incited prejudice against recent immigrants, and the failure of the Communist Party to win any important office anywhere or even a single Presidential elector, show that this confidence in the voters is amply justified.

Only once hitherto has Congress tried to take over the job of sifting out a bad political party. That was when the Federalists passed the Sedition Act of 1798, under which the owners and editors of the four chief Jeffersonian newspapers in the country were indicted, and several other editors and well-known Jeffersonian politicians were convicted and sent to prison. This example proves that the definition of what is a "bad" political party may depend on the ideas of the particular people in power, who can shape the definition to cripple the adversaries they would like to get rid of.

The Mundt Bill uses a different method to sift out a "bad" party. It does not bother with jurymen like the Sedition Act of 1798, but puts the control in the hands of three officials selected by the party in power. The basic idea in this method is to pick out characteristics of an objectionable sort which are possessed by some members of the party you want to smash, then brand the whole party with those objectionable characteristics, and consequently make it carry a heavy load in the political race against competing parties which run unburdened.

Now, this may seem very clever when it is used against parties with a communistic tinge, but it is a game two can play at. Once Congress passes this bill and gets people accustomed to the method of having officials sift out "bad" parties instead of letting the voters do it themselves, other laws can be drafted with new definitions of badness to hit some party which has nothing to do with communism. There is no logical limit to the possibility of thus proscribing an opposition party, for every party has some members with qualities capable of arousing intense and widespread detestation.

Let us imagine that the method of this bill had become familiar by the time the Republican Party was founded. Among its

members were many prominent Abolitionists, who had urged or even participated in violations of the Fugitive Slave Law. So in 1858 the Democratic Congress passed a statute defining a "Disloyal political party" as one which "is dominated or controlled by persons who advocate resistance to or disobedience of any law of the United States." The statute compelled such a party to register, with all the consequent disabilities now contained in the Mundt Bill. A "Disloyal Activities Commission," appointed by President Buchanan and comprising two Democrats and one Southern Whig, determined that the Republican Party was dominated by law-breaking Abolitionists. This decision was affirmed by a majority of the Supreme Court which had lately refused to free Dred Scott. So the Republican Party had to register, list the names and addresses of all its members every year, mark all its mail "Disseminated by the Republican Party, a Disloyal organization," and no Republican could hold any federal office. Would Lincoln have been willing to run on the Disloyal ticket? Would he have been elected?

What is the need of introducing such a method of political proscription among free American institutions in order to get rid of the Communist Party of America, which is so nearly dead already as a political party that it hasn't nominated a candidate of its own for President for at least two elections? As Senator Carter Glass remarked, "What's the use of wasting dynamite when insect-powder will do?"

The reply may be made that, although the Communist Party amounts to nothing in elections, it still exists as an organization making policies and spreading propaganda of a bad sort, and hence this bill is necessary to break it up completely. How much good will that really do? No doubt, if this bill be enacted, there will no longer be any organization called the Communist Party. My guess is that it will not register, but simply go out of existence within thirty days after the President signs this bill. Then nobody can be punished for failure to register. The present 70,000 Communists will very likely join other political parties. They will be no less harmful than they are now, because they will continue to have the same ideas and probably be more resentful than ever, on account of this new law. And there is no reason to expect that

they will stop meeting together in some way or other. Anybody who has studied the history of Irish societies which were working to give Roman Catholics the vote, in the days of Daniel O'Connell, can tell pretty well what will happen. Every time a particular society was declared unlawful, it was promptly dissolved and its former members started a new society to do exactly the same thing. So we can expect the formation of a large number of Shakespearean Societies, Dante Institutes, chess clubs, indoor baseball associations, etc. Meanwhile you will no longer know whether there are 70,000 Communists at heart or 700,000. In short, if we are scared about the possibility of Communists under the bed, let us cling hard to the existing system which encourages most of them to get on the bed where we can see them.

Finally if we drive the present Communists into other political parties, they may be able to do much more damage than now. Candidates will be found in those lawful parties who will promise extreme measures in order to satisfy their new left-wing members. As for the former Communists who will not vote at all after the Party vanishes, the prime cause of all dangerous political agitation is discontent and outlawing Communists is likely to double their discontent. So long as they are a lawful political party, they can say, "This isn't such a bad country after all, for at least it does give us a chance to vote for the man we want to." But if we outlaw their party, then they can say, "This country won't let us earn a decent living and now it won't even let us vote. So let's try something else."

We ought not to discuss this bill as if it affected only one political party—the Communist Party of America. That is the chief target of the bill, but its enforcers do not have to stop there. How about following up the large number of former Communists who joined the Progressive Party, which they supported at the 1948 election? A good many Democrats have excellent reasons for wanting to cripple the Progressive Party; it is common knowledge that Mr. Wallace drew many votes away from Mr. Truman last November. So there may be strong pressure in favor of proceeding against the Progressive Party under the Mundt-Johnston Law before the 1952 election.

Suppose that the Progressive Party convention is held early

in July, 1952, and renominates Mr. Wallace. A few days later the Party learns that it is charged with having become a "Communist political organization" or at least a "Communist-front organization," which seems reasonably possible under the language of the bill. Hence the bill requires it to register within thirty days after the convention. If it does register, the Progressive Party and its members will operate under all the disabilities in the statute.

So the officers decide not to register the Progressive Party with the Attorney General, but to fight the issue through the Commission and the courts. Mr. Wallace and the officers of the Party know that they will have to conduct the campaign with the opprobrium caused by government evidence in contemporaneous hearings before the Commission, but at least, so they think, they will escape all the disabilities and penalties in this bill.

But are they right about escaping the penalties of fines and imprisonment? I don't believe so. The bill has a joker in it. Of course, if the final order is in favor of the Progressive Party, nobody can be punished. The trouble will come if they contest without registering, and then the final order goes against them. Let us suppose that the court decides early in December, 1952, that the Progressive Party *is* a "Communist political organization" and *became* such at its presidential convention early in July. This decision reaches back to its initial failure to register. The statute required it to do so within 30 days after the convention. That means that the officers of the Party had "the duty" to register early in August and also to file a statement listing the names and addresses of every member of the Progressive Party. Since a million people voted for Wallace in 1948, this is quite a job to do in 30 days! Well, they didn't do it, and so the officers are liable to the statutory penalties "each individual having a duty to register or to file any registration statement . . . on behalf of such organization, . . . shall, upon conviction of failure to so register," etc., "be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than \$2000, . . . or imprisonment for not less than two years . . ., or by both." I do not see how the officers can get away from this punishment, if they lose the registration case.

Furthermore, four months or over 120 days must elapse, from

early August to early December, when they do actually register in accordance with the court's decision. The bill says that "each day of failure to register...shall constitute a separate offense." Therefore any officer of the Party who had a duty to register is liable to a fine of not less than \$240,000 or imprisonment of not less than 240 years, or both.

It is my well considered opinion that any good lawyer who was consulted by the officers of the Progressive Party in July would have to advise them that they ran a very serious risk of this enormous punishment unless they registered early in August. Human nature being what it is most of these officers would probably resign at once. It would be pretty hard to get anybody to direct the campaign after the end of July. The Progressive Party would be broken up right away by fears of losing the registration contest. Even if it won that contest in court in December, it would be just as broken up in August.

To sum up this matter of "Communist political organizations:" Probably the Communist Party of America does have some links with Moscow, and certainly some of its members engage in talk and organizational activities which are very repulsive to most Americans. But even if anything is gained by breaking up a party which comprises only 1/20 of 1% of our population, the Smith Act of 1940 is amply sufficient. So is it wise, for the sake of getting rid of the Communist Party, to enact still another sedition law, which can easily be used to break up some other party to which many honest patriotic citizens belong and to warp and demoralize the normal processes of self-government? To pass the Mundt Bill in order to hit Communists is like using a hammer to swat a wasp on baby's head.

4. *The registration of a "Communist-front organization."* This part of the bill is likely to reach many more groups, whose purposes are often cultural as well as political and who are engaged in exchanging ideas rather than winning elections. So the interference with the lives of private citizens is much more extensive than in the case of "Communist political organizations."

Here again, there is something to be said for a general registration law requiring *all groups* which attempt to influence public opinion to disclose the pertinent facts about themselves through sys-

tematic procedures. The harmfulness of non-disclosure is by no means confined to "Communist-front organizations." For instance, virulent anti-Semitic circulars and pamphlets falsely and libellously accusing long lists of well-known decent citizens with being disloyal are often widely mailed by organizations with high-sounding names, which take good care not to mention their authors and the men who put up the money. A broad statute to break through this vicious anonymity of defamers of every sort is recommended in the 1947 Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. On the other hand, I have some serious doubts whether such a statute will be a desirable remedy for vicious anonymity; it is likely to be enforced inefficiently and in a haphazard way, and to stifle more good views than bad views.

At all events, if Congress thinks a compulsory disclosure law for propaganda is needed, then it is needed for all sides of political, racial, and religious controversies. Such a law should seek to force into broad daylight *all the enemies of democracy* and not just a particular portion of them as in this bill, leaving the rest to remain in the darkness they love, "because their ways are evil."

We can guess what sort of groups will be classed as "Communist-front" from the list of subversive organizations made by Attorney General Clark. The restriction on the use of the mails will probably be a burdensome limitation on several organizations which serve very desirable purposes, even if they include Communists among their supporters. Thus the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which is on the Attorney General's list, has been largely backed by medical friends of Dr. Walter Cannon, a great physiologist, in order to rescue from tyranny, misery, and disease thousands of refugees from Franco Spain. It is ironical that men who profess to be engaged in an attack on totalitarian dictatorship should do their best to discourage help for the victims of one of the cruelest of totalitarian dictatorships. The ease with which a desirable organization can be condemned as communistic on the basis of very thin evidence is shown by Professor Walter Gellhorn of Columbia in a Harvard Law Review article relating to the wholly unfounded blacklisting (or redlisting) of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare by the House Un-American Committee. Although the Southern Conference is not yet on Attorney

General Clark's list, it is possible that the Un-American Committee may bring about its condemnation by the Commission set up by this bill. Then that organization would have to describe itself on all its publications as a "Communist organization." This novel stigma recalls the practice of medieval princes to require Jews to wear special marks on their coats.

5. *Practical considerations about various enforcement provisions.*

The various penalties provided by this bill for organizations which are registered or ought to register are very severe and will interfere greatly with the lives and liberties of American citizens who have committed no acts of force or violence and most of whom have not been proved to be dangerous individuals.

The first penalty is fine or imprisonment, with the oppressive cumulative provisions already mentioned. For example, an individual who has done nothing in the way of wrongful conduct or wicked words except that he is adjudged to be a member of a "Communist political organization" without having his name listed will be fined \$2000 or imprisoned for two years *for every day* he neglects to register. He will be punished worse than any counterfeiter, not because he is bad, but because of the activities of other people. This conception of guilt by association is abhorrent in a free country.

The second penalty is exclusion from federal employment of any member of a "Communist political organization." This is not just a question of not employing Communists in government jobs. The bill may (as already pointed out) bar any supporters of Henry Wallace. This prohibition includes teaching in the Washington public schools. Furthermore, prospective employees who are open to any possible suspicion may easily be kept out of such teaching and other government work without any determination by the Commission (or a court) that they really are members of a proscribed organization. This will happen because another provision punishes any official who knowingly employs a member of such an organization. Consequently, if the official in charge of employment has any doubts, he will turn the suspected applicant away in order to save his own skin. He will not want to run any chances of going to prison himself.

In view of the President's Loyalty Order, it is hard to see the

slightest need for this fresh combing-over of government employees. The completion of the loyalty check resulted in the discharge of 1/300 of 1% of federal employees. Only 1/10 of 1% resigned while under suspicion, many of them probably because they preferred private jobs where they were treated like honest men. No one among the millions of employees subjected to the loyalty test has been indicted for a crime. The Loyalty Review Boards are composed of men with experience in important work, who are more likely to be competent and impartial than the Commission set up by this bill.

The third penalty is the denial of a passport to members of a "Communist political organization." We are constantly blaming the Russians for not allowing anybody whom their government dislikes to travel abroad, and yet we are now proposing to do much the same thing ourselves. Of course the existing law allows anybody who is personally dangerous to be refused a passport. Why isn't that enough to keep the country safe?

The fourth penalty is the exclusion from the mails of publications relating to the affairs of a "Communist political organization" or of the numerous bodies which are likely to be classed as "Communist-front." This includes letters as well as printed matter, so long as the letter is intended to be read by more than one person. How can any enforcement official tell that the contents of a sealed letter violate this bill without opening the letter? Therefore the bill involves breaking into private correspondence, one of the most odious forms of petty tyranny.

Taking an over-all view, I see that many other kinds of prying besides opening letters will be necessary if this bill is to be effectively enforced. The Commission hearings cannot help being inquisitions into men's "dangerous thoughts." Conversations will be reported by participants, so that men will begin wondering whether it is safe to say anything to supposed friends. People will eavesdrop on their neighbors. Secret police will be multiplied, to catch all these new crimes. Spies will be introduced undercover into suspected organizations in the hope of collecting evidence. This has already been going on extensively in the Communist Party, and the government evidence in the pending trial in New York City reveals that at least three undercover

agents of the United States were actually engaged in persuading men to become Communists and take part in what their official employers considered to be a criminal conspiracy against the United States. It is only a step to *agents provocateurs*, spies who incite organizations to commit unlawful acts for the sake of getting damaging evidence against those organizations—the sort of thing which the La Follette Committee showed to be going on inside labor unions. You get a man changing so often from revolutionist to spy and back again that he does not know himself which he is. It is like Russia under the Czars. (See Joseph Conrad, *Under Western Eyes*.) It is bad enough to have numerous undercover spies inside the Communist Party. The passage of this bill will spread them into a whole new flock of suspected organizations, many of them much more legitimate than that party. No doubt, all sorts of queer devices are sometimes necessary to catch really dangerous criminals, like gangsters and violent revolutionists, but the enforcement methods which this bill requires are a terribly high price to pay for tracking down nothing except objectionable ideas.

In 1920 Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York vetoed a bill which authorized the attorney general to conduct investigations of violations of the state sedition law. He said:

There is no just cause for providing any different method for enforcing the criminal anarchy statute from that employed in enforcing the other penal laws of the State—through the agencies of the grand jury, the magistrate and the district attorneys of the respective counties of the State. The traditional abhorrence of a free people of all kinds of spies and secret police is valid and justified and calls for the disapproval of this measure.

X

In this address I have not gone into questions of constitutionality. The main question is the wisdom of these bills and not their validity. Such an extraordinary measure can be justified only by a tremendous danger within our nation. Are these novel penalties, is this novel machinery, required to save the country? It is not enough that Communists are pestiferous people or indulge

in big talk about taking over our government. The question is whether they are within a million miles of doing so. Jefferson said in 1801: "I believe this the strongest government on earth." Because I confidently share his belief, I hope very much that Congress will reject these unheard of bills, and, if not, that Harry S. Truman will veto them with a message which, like the First Inaugural of Thomas Jefferson, will drive out fear and restore our lost confidence in freedom.

I ought not to close without trying to answer one question which is in many of your minds. What shall we do with the 70,000 Communists in our midst if we are determined to stand firmly with the principles of Jefferson and stop trying to stamp out objectionable ideas by law? Though not dangerous, they are a disturbing element in our population. How can we most wisely minimize whatever possibilities of harm they possess?

My first suggestion is that for a while we look at American Communists as an American problem, and forget all about the world Communistic movement. Leave that to Dean Acheson and the military people, whose job it is. Just think of Communists as a small disaffected minority group in the United States, with ideas considerably at odds with the rest of us, but no more so than anti-Semites and ex-admirers of Mussolini.

Second. Instead of tearing ourselves to pieces with fears of what some vague mass of American Communists may do to us in the future, it would be wise to look at them as individuals now. A sampling survey like the Lynds' in *Middletown* could find out what made this man and that man become a Communist in the first place, and what he is like when he is not going to party meetings or handing out pamphlets. Goethe said: "It is a wise maxim of governments not to deal with men as they ought to be [or ought not to be], but as they are."

Third. After thus looking at Communists as distinct human beings and not a mob of ogres, we might find it absurd to go on assuming that every Communist is the spitting image of every other Communist. Even distinguished university presidents have fallen into this fallacy. It is the same fallacy displayed by Harold Laski, when he talks about American businessmen as if they were interchangeable parts like the bolts in a Ford car. Some Com-

munists may be no more like others than Sewell Avery is like Ralph Flanders.

My conjecture is that such an approach will make Communists fall into two classes. The smaller class consists of fanatics whose minds are closed, who really owe spiritual allegiance to the Soviet Union and would do a good deal to help out the Kremlin. They are irreconcilables, like the people in Jefferson's day who longed for a monarchy. They want to rock the boat, and so do anti-Semites and Negro-haters. But a great country can put up with a sprinkling of irreconcilables, so long as they don't *do* anything. After all, the man who wants to rock the boat doesn't have much scope on the *Queen Elizabeth*.

The other sort of Communists, I surmise, love this country in their own way as much as any of us, but they resent real or fancied inequalities and injustices. They are sick of both the major parties. For many of them perhaps, whatever foreign influences exist are largely a consequence rather than a cause of their disaffection, which really arises from their resentment toward certain conditions at home.

At all events, the problem of unfanatical Communists will not be solved by ousting them from every sort of work for which they are fitted and trained, thereby leaving them with nothing to do for the rest of their lives except to be embittered agitators. The true remedy is to bring these discontented men out of the muddy backwaters into the clear currents of national life, to turn them into loyal citizens. It is the task of a wise psychiatrist—to reach isolated and perplexed minds and bring them into renewed communication with their fellowmen.

Surely, that task can best be accomplished if we leave these disaffected men as free as the rest of us to make their grievances known, if we constantly try to reduce the inequalities and hardships of which they justly complain and also endeavor to persuade them that sometimes they are asking for better bread than is made of wheat. Many of these extremists are young, and youth is a fault everybody outgrows.

Above all, the way to make men love their country is to give them a good country, imperfect like everything else in this world but where the shortcomings are getting constantly recognized and

then removed. And it must be a free country. The great revolutions in history were in Bourbon France and Czarist Russia, nations completely equipped with sedition laws and censorship. The countries which have inspired men's utmost devotion have been free countries—Athens, Switzerland, Holland, and our own while it stood firmly by the ideals of Jefferson and the First Amendment.

The only way to preserve "the existence of free American institutions" is to make free institutions a living force. To ignore them in the very process of purporting to defend them, as frightened men now urge, will leave us little worth defending.

We must choose, and choose very soon, between freedom and fear—we cannot have both. If the citizens of the United States persist much longer in being afraid, the real rulers of this country will be fanatics fired with a zeal to save grown men from objectionable ideas by putting them under the care of official nursemaids. Freedom is not safety, but opportunity.

FIRE BELL IN THE NIGHT¹

By HENRY M. WRISTON

Brown University

Every once in a while an event occurs which does not seem in itself to be of great magnitude, but which is a portent of something vastly significant. In 1820, when the admission of Missouri as a state raised the slavery issue, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Like a fire bell in the night, [it] awakened and filled me with terror." Of the same event, a representative from Georgia said, "You have kindled a fire that all the waters of the ocean cannot put out, which seas of blood can only extinguish." Ten years afterward all the pollsters would have said that Jefferson's alarm and Cobb's prophecy looked ridiculous, but eventually both were amply vindicated. Great crises seldom mature rapidly; those who read aright the signs of the times may well take thought when they perceive "a cloud small as a man's hand."

Teachers' strikes should be regarded as "a fire bell in the night." From a quantitative point of view they have not been important. Relative to the huge number of students in our schools and the

¹ Address given at the monthly meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on November 4, 1948 in New York City; reprinted through the courtesy of Dr. Wriston and of the Chamber from the November, 1948 issue of its *Bulletin*.

On this occasion Dr. Wriston was requested "to discuss charges of Communism in our schools and colleges." In introducing Dr. Wriston, Mr. Frederick E. Hasler, the Chairman, said:

"American business men are becoming increasingly concerned with the spread of radical thinking in our educational institutions. They read in the presses of activities of so-called student Communist groups, of teachers being accused of Communist affiliation or of having Communist leanings. They wonder just how much or how little of the educational dollar is being used to teach our youth faith in and loyalty to American ideals and traditions.

"No one is better qualified to answer these questions than the distinguished gentleman who is our guest of honor and speaker today, the head of one of our great educational institutions. He is a gifted author, an orator, and a militant champion of the ideals and enterprises which have made America great . . ."

—THE EDITORS

huge American educational program, the teaching days lost, if your memories of school days have not faded, have been insignificant and the knowledge lost unnoticeable.

The teachers' economic situation urgently called for redress; public authorities were laggard in recognizing the issue, dilatory and halfhearted in attempts to meet it. A crisis in salaries was the occasion for the strikes, but it by no means supplies a complete explanation. For nothing is more firmly established historically than that the teacher is poorly paid. One has only to come from a family where teaching has been part of its tradition to be acutely aware of how poorly paid teachers have always been. If there is any labor of love which involves contributed services to a high degree, teaching shares the distinction with preaching. That single fact is all the evidence necessary to prove that teachers' salaries were only the occasion and not the cause of the strikes.

There is no possibility of accounting for the strikes without taking into consideration the drift of many intellectuals away from a profound conviction as to the rightness and the validity of the existing social, economic, and political situation, or at least the situation as existed day before yesterday. I mention teachers' strikes first because they are dramatic and easily observed and not subject to argument as to their reality.

So far as universities and colleges are concerned, there is criticism of the "Red" doctrines supposedly preached in the classroom. State legislatures launch investigations. Men lash at the symptoms but fail to make adequate diagnosis. Neither "Red" nor "un-American" is a precise term. Each is an omnibus catchword employed to indicate any disharmony between the teacher and his social-economic-political environment. I agree entirely with what General Eisenhower said last night, that the colleges have very few Communists or even Communist sympathizers on their faculties. But it would be folly to deny that there are many teachers who are intensely critical of our present social and economic structures—both of which seem to some of them to be stratifying dangerously. I am not going to minimize the evidence of the discontent on the part of many intellectuals with the present state of American society and economics.

II

My purpose today is neither to praise nor to condemn; I am essaying an analysis, seeking to make clear what caused the emotional tensions now all too obvious. At the end I hope to present some intimations as to how so dangerous a trend may be reversed.

Perhaps the best place to begin is to point out that many or most of the arguments with regard to the American economic system have no direct application to teachers in schools, colleges, and universities. The profit motive, often described as the main-spring of business, and properly so described, is not and should never become the dominant element in their lives. For example, America has many Nobel Prize winners in the sciences; it would be a shallow and ignorant man who gauged their worth by their income. What is true of them applies also to thousands upon thousands who quietly do their work in schools, colleges, and universities. Without their labors neither our society nor our economic system can survive; yet they function to a large extent outside that system of economics.

That may be one reason why industrialists sometimes find it hard to understand professors. It accounts for the scornful comment so often heard: "If professors had enough ability and the competitive spirit they would not be teaching." Nothing could be further from the truth. Those who do not know the academic world at first hand seldom have any idea how competitive it is. Nor can they appreciate its hazards. Free enterprise is looked upon by business men as the epitome of risk-taking, but the research worker, concerned with advancing the frontiers of knowledge, takes, as President Conant has well said, "a tremendous gamble. Only those who have spent many years in this type of work can ever understand how great is the risk and what the emotional consequences of that risk are." Often a man invests several years of his life before he knows or can know whether his research is a success or a failure. I am intimately acquainted with that risk.

Indeed, I can speak of it at first hand because after I had spent five years on a piece of research, I asked three experts in the field, all at one university, what they thought of it, and they said there

was nothing to do in the field. The same men gave me a prize for it five years later, but I had to invest those ten years of my life before it could be subjected to the critical judgment of my peers as to whether it was a success or failure.

The professor is a risk-taker, but unlike businessmen, he does not profit financially when he succeeds. A professor of physics or psychology often has to pay for the publication of his most original papers; learned books bring no financial rewards. He receives no patent income from the fundamental discoveries which industry is free to exploit for profit.

Being, in this sense, outside the economic order the intellectual does not share its gains directly. Nevertheless, he suffers from its weaknesses. In the great depression teachers' salaries were cut; in many instances reductions were drastic. Very few colleges or universities escaped cuts; some were very serious indeed. Now that inflation is here teachers are not receiving increases comparable to those of workers in industry.

Professors can say with a great deal of objective truth that they share the losses but do not share the gains. When there is hardship they do not escape it; when there is prosperity they still do not escape hardship. If that is true—and I have never heard it disputed—(and this is the keyword of the sentence) they have less *firsthand* reason for enthusiastic defense of all aspects of our social-economic structure. They are in a position to consider it from a detached point of view; their observations and conclusions are not biased by self-interest.

Moreover, the nature of their work creates an obligation to be critical. They must re-examine all premises as they look for new truths and fresh insights. Angry objectors to intellectual radicalism assert that professors ought to have an over-riding loyalty. I agree heartily. But their deepest loyalty is like that of the poet—it is to an ideal. As Goethe felt that "above all nations is humanity," so, for the true intellectual, above all other loyalties is loyalty to truth.

The public recognizes this to some degree. For example, no one asks whether the scientist is "radical" or "conservative" when he deals with the atom. He must be willing to follow wherever thought and experiment may lead. The history of concepts of

the atom during the last fifty years reveals revolutions in thought of the first magnitude. That is what we expect; we ask only whether the scientist is making new discoveries and expanding the boundaries of truth.

Now this obligation applies equally to those who study society, economics, and politics. We must expect—and not fear—new ideas in these fields. In the best sense of the word professors must be radical, ready to deviate from ancient belief when fresh insights, novel analyses, or additional data so dictate. Scholars have two reasons for objectivity therefore. They are not part of the main stream of economic life, and the nature of their profession requires them to hold in check emotional commitments which might divert thought.

From both these angles of vision they can see that economics and politics are so closely intertwined as to be inseparable. Economic forces are never left without political guidance; every economy is to some extent a “managed” economy. There is no such thing and has never been such a thing as “laissez faire.”

The intervention of the government in the economic system to control (or attempt to control) its swing in one direction or another is the rule, not the exception. I found I was sitting beside a portrait of Alexander Hamilton here. Before speaking to you, I read through his famous report of 1791, to be certain that I would not in any way misrepresent what he said. If we were to use modern terms in describing his critically important argument, it would be called an essay in favor of “planned economy.” Alexander Hamilton specifically rejected letting nature take its course; more particularly he denied “that industry, if left to itself, will naturally find its way to the most useful and profitable employment.” Indeed, he asserted without reservation “that the interference and aid of . . . governments are indispensable.” He proposed the use of public funds as capital through the public debt.

Hamilton’s reasoning was based upon the necessity for proper balance between agriculture, manufacture, and commerce in building a great nation. Without reservation he accepted government responsibility to attain that end. He believed it to be the interest of countries to diversify the activities of their citizens. He elaborated the arguments for protection. “Protection,” need I say,

is a governmental shield from the operation of economic laws. It is designed to affect prices, profits, and products—all by managing economic processes. Political action to control economic forces has not been advanced solely by radicals and this is a good time to emphasize that. Hamilton is the final answer to any such notion.

Both Democrats and Republicans have long promised—and are still promising—to interfere with economic laws when they hurt; they have both promised—and still promise—to mitigate the harshness of nature's processes in the economic sphere.

It would be possible to give endless illustrations of efforts to control our economy, either directly or indirectly. The academician, familiar with this history, knows we are not dealing with absolutes, but with relatives—not “shall government intervene?” but “how much shall it exert its influence?” He is not so much shocked, therefore, by proposals to manage the economy a little more as is the businessman who has never thought much about the past record.

III

There is another reason why teachers are critical. They observe and analyze the deviations from orthodoxy upon the part of the priesthood of American capitalism. “Faith without works is dead.” Often defenders of the faith in “free enterprise” do not show forth in their actions the ardent profession of their lips.

More particularly, the historian observes that it is not government alone which has prevented the normal functioning of the price system; individuals and corporations have gone even further than government. Many years ago it became necessary for government to restrain private manipulators of the price system. It was a rock-ribbed Ohio Republican conservative, John Sherman, who gave his name to the Anti-Trust Act—the cornerstone of many subsequent policies. I am not holding him responsible for the present fogs of uncertainties, but no one today would pretend that there were not vast economic abuses which made that or some other law essential.

And what were those abuses? They were efforts upon the part of small groups to deflect the operations of economic laws for their

own profit. Trusts, cartels, trade agreements, rebates, and hundreds of other practices that will come to your own minds, constituted a confession of lack of faith in the beneficence of economic normalcy and an attempt to distort the natural functioning of economic laws. That manipulations have been frequent and formidable is transparent to any objective observer.

The academic critic may be pardoned when he is skeptical that all such practices have now been eliminated and that those who profess complete faith in free competition and the "automatic" operation of economic laws will henceforth show by their acts that they fully believe their own words.

Moreover, business and government are not always on opposite sides, not even when the Democrats are in power. The most notable recent instance was the NRA. It was not designed by theorists, but by practical politicians and hard-headed business men so little aware of the fundamental presuppositions of free enterprise that they were ready to abandon their birthright for a mess of pottage. Seeking to meet a desperate situation they threw economic orthodoxy and free enterprise to the winds. Looking back upon the codes and what they sought to do, no candid observer could reach a different conclusion. Even though it may be forgotten by the businessmen who participated with such zest, the record of their economic heterodoxy is there for him who runs to read.

It is well known that I do not advocate a "planned economy"; quite the contrary, I have fought against it in every way possible. On grounds ethical, philosophical, and psychological; for reasons social, economic, and political; to the end that we may have a free society with a dynamic economy, I am for the enterprise system, with as little control as will assure order and establish justice. Before we denounce those who do advocate such programs we must recognize that the economy has never operated freely, "automatically," without controls. That being so we are never offered a sharp, clear alternative: "Shall we have controls, or shall we have no controls?" It is always "how much control?"—a relative, not an absolute, matter.

I have mentioned two broad reasons why intellectuals may easily become critical of our social-economic structure. First: they

suffer from its failures; they do not profit commensurately from its successes. Second: scientific objectivity requires them to observe the reality that, when the chips are down, many who argue most ardently against a planned economy support it to a greater or less degree; by their acts they deny their affirmations—or modify them more than they realize.

There is a third reason why intellectuals may be drawn into support of a managed economy. Probably the most massive single economic fact in America today is the public debt. Not long ago able expositors proved to their own satisfaction that there could not be a debt of any such size and that if contracted it could not be managed. Today that once incredible debt is a fact; moreover the management of it is inescapably a public act.

I think the management of that debt and the policies ancillary and incidental to its management have been markedly inflationary. But no one—and when I say “no one” I think I am speaking by the book—has any belief that the debt can be left wholly to the operation of economic forces. When the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board speaks of having an “instrument of monetary management,” and the Chairman of J. P. Morgan and Company, discussing the duties of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, says, “This is no time for rough management of our economy,” the fair implications of such phrases need no elaboration.

It is clear that government action will have marked effects. That would suggest to observers whose profits from prosperity are slender and whose losses from adversity are severe that the government should protect the interests of the so-called “middle class” whose status has been deteriorating alarmingly. They have every reason to know that thus far they are the forgotten men in the management of the debt.

There is a fourth reason for the discontent of many intellectuals, which is not economic but social. There was a time when the significance of their function was fully recognized. The famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated that “religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.” Even earlier, in 1764, the Brown University Charter stated it explicitly: “Whereas institutions for liberal education

are highly beneficial to society...they have therefore justly merited and received the attention and encouragement of every wise and well-regulated state." Last night Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich read from Washington's Farewell Address words to the same effect.

Those phrases embodied a deep public conviction. For a century and a half to be a professor in an institution of learning was to hold a position of great distinction. One evidence of this was the eagerness of many others to be called "professor"—even phrenologists and magicians. Today, on the contrary, even on the campus, men eschew the title. While it is preserved within academic circles, professors do not like to carry the label outside.

An incidental illustration of the low esteem in which the intellectual is held was the characteristic caricature of the New Deal, if you can remember back that far in the face of today—it was always a tatterdemalion academic in ragged cap and gown. No future historian will be deceived into thinking that the New Deal was a product of professors. It was fabricated by worldly-wise and vote-wise politicians who changed not only their direction but even their basic theories when it seemed politically profitable. The switch from rigid economy to spending as a way to prosperity epitomizes their readiness to reverse the field. Of course many discontented intellectuals put rational façades upon the operative policies of those who really shaped developments. Yet it was the academics who were pilloried for "crack-pot theories."

Lack of respect for the intellectual is reflected in salary payments. When both salaries and public recognition are inadequate, the normal effect is to alienate those who are so treated.

IV

The decline in the social status of the intellectual has occurred at the most irrational as well as the most inopportune time. More than ever before technology and production are utterly dependent upon the theorist. Few studies were ever more "abstract," few more "remote from daily life" than the pioneer work in modern physics. Studies on the disintegration of atoms during the thirties were sensational in a limited circle—but unknown or a joke

to the "real" world. No one thinks them funny now. It was the "pure," "useless" research spreading from university to university around the world which supplied the foundation for the use of atomic energy. If, as is so often asserted, we live in an atomic age, that age was born in the universities.

Similarly, if the government debt is the most conspicuous single datum in our economic life, it is also a fact that it is going to be managed by university-trained economists—good or bad, orthodox or heterodox. They will certainly exercise an influence far beyond that of economists in any other time in history.

As fundamental science must precede applied science, as the theorist precedes the practitioner in industry and in government, so also, much more subtly, but just as really, the assumptions which underlie many of our everyday thoughts and actions spring from the intellectual group. The Kinsey Report has been a best-seller for reasons which I do not understand; it would never have been published but for the work of Freud. Many an advertising man who knows little about behaviorist psychology is governed, nevertheless, in his techniques by what the behaviorists taught. People who would resent being regarded as Marxist in any way nonetheless employ many of his ideas. Indeed a good deal of business practice is predicated upon Marxian economic determinism, though free enterprisers would shudder at the source, if they were aware of it.

John Maynard Keynes was a professor with novel ideas about the economic system. Those ideas when popularized and seized by the politicians have in many ways affected the economic policies of states. Long before he was heard of in business circles he had a keen perception of the power of ideas, for he wrote: "The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. *Indeed the world is ruled by little else.*" Many an opponent of Keynesian economics vouches for *that* truth. One of those opponents wrote on one occasion: "In the short run, it is true, ideas are unimportant and ineffective, *but in the long run they rule the world.*" The ideas of the man in the street are often the diluted, popularized thoughts of intellectuals.

This can be illustrated again and again throughout history.

The French Encyclopedists who turned on the government in the eighteenth century were criticizing the abuses of absolute monarchy; their warnings were too long unheeded and a cataclysmic revolt followed. Similarly, the Russian monarchy many years later lost even the tolerance of the intellectuals and it was destroyed in the catastrophe of revolution. In our own time there was a strong intellectual element—which I can summarize with Bernard Shaw, with Harold Laski, Beatrice and Sidney Webb, and other names which occur to you—in the leadership of the Labor Party in Britain which dedicated itself to the fundamental alteration in the nation's social, economic, and political structure. Intellectuals are often highly sensitized to the dangers that inhere in a social system; their warnings may be storm signals which we continue to ignore at our peril.

Even when an idea is wrong, it may have great influence. It is one of the Marxian dogmas that capitalism means war. That theory runs counter to two dominant realities in American life that you and I can see—no other great power was ever so pacifist as the United States and until recently businessmen were predominantly isolationist, in large sections of the nation they still are. Thus the Marxist ideology is refuted by easily perceptible facts. Yet that does not prevent large segments of the world from accepting the error as gospel; indeed the continued repetition of the erroneous belief is bringing us to the very brink of a world cataclysm at this very moment.

Right or wrong, the intellectuals will have tremendous influence. When decisive responsibilities lie in the hands of any group it is not wise to treat them with grave social disrespect. Yet that is precisely what produced teachers' strikes. Though teachers influence our children, society remained callous to the teachers' adverse economic position until startled by drastic and dramatic action. Public apathy arising from unconscious contempt provoked a forceful reaction. The use of power is inappropriate to the intellectual; he should count on reason and persuasion to attain his ends and I am not condoning the teachers' strikes. But force, however inappropriate, is always the ultimate recourse when everything else fails.

If one looks at the matter with wide open eyes—devoid of pre-

conception and prejudice—it is clear that the striking teachers were treating society as society had treated them. Because society mistreated them their respect for the political structure declined. The restraints which should have prevented people with such social responsibilities from making war upon society were loosened. On the basis of *power*, they sought—and *gained*—things which had been denied them on the basis of *values*. As in every war, there were faults on both sides—but the basic fault was the gross neglect by the American public which drove the teachers to substitute pressure tactics for reason.

V

College and university professors have not yet gone so far. They still exhibit the individualism of the thinker. As President Conant has well said, "Of all the activities of man today the one which must remain most starkly individual is research." Ideas are born in individual minds; they never become communal property until their originality has been lost. Until the scholar finds himself in a hopeless situation, he is loath to organize defensively. He prefers to associate with other scholars only for mutual enrichment from the free exchange of thought, for the satisfaction that comes from the interplay of lively and fertile minds.

But there are clear indications that trouble can develop here as in 18th Century France, 19th Century Russia, and 20th Century Britain. It is promoted when business men scoff at the theorist, saying: "It may be good in theory, but it is no good in practice." I don't know how many times I have had that thrown at me. Nothing is ever right in theory if it is not true and real, but stupidity and archaism in industrial practice often fail to exploit experimental and theoretical advances.

Many a basic discovery has lain gathering dust on the shelf for want of imagination to see its possibility. Incidentally, there is a touch of irony in the often-heard demand that professors should leave their ivory towers, abandon theories, and do something practical for the benefit of society.

Do you know where that idea comes from? That is a Communist idea. They have a word for it. They call it social utility.

They want no research without social utility. They denounce pure, free research where a man follows curiosity wherever it leads, and leaves it to time and technology to find utility in the new truths he discovers. It is odd indeed to find free enterprisers adopting Marxist views of research. It is another instance of insufficient awareness of the fundamental presuppositions of our own system. If you want free enterprise in business, you must accept free enterprise not as a necessary evil, but as an essential virtue in the intellectual world.

The theorist, the technologist, and the production man are in an indissoluble partnership; each has his place; but the initiation of the productive cycle is with the professor. It is folly to sell his work short. The self-styled "practical" man is often the one in error; the least alert are frequently the most critical of the theorist.

Such obscurantism and current anti-intellectualism hold down faculty salaries and prevent adequate research funds from being available. And I speak from firsthand experience because I once worked with a great industry and the only problem that was really hard for me to solve was to get executives to realize that the more fundamental the research, the larger dividends it would pay in the long run. Something must be done to join the professor's overriding loyalty to the truth with his natural love of his country and its social-political-economic institutions. The suggestion that we should "crack down" on critics, fire the dissenters, or make them so uncomfortable that they remain silent is the worst possible program. Academic freedom is all the professors have left—and however widely their political, social, and economic views may vary, they will unite in defense of that last bulwark of their profession.

The academic is willing to accept a relatively low economic ceiling. I wonder if you know what that is. I don't suppose there are more than fifty professors in America getting as much as \$20,000, and the average salary of professors in America is under \$5000. I say, they are willing to accept a low economic ceiling if they have compensatory satisfaction in terms of social response, if they hold positions of responsibility and dignity and honor which their importance justifies. *Among* the necessities is an increase in salary—and the need is substantial and urgent. Something had

better be done soon before stark necessity forces the professors to follow the teachers into pressure tactics and substitute power for reason.

VI

There is one final element in this analysis which calls for comment. That is a changing balance, or one might properly call it a growing imbalance, between publicly supported and privately supported education. You don't see that very much in New York, but I have just been in the Middle West in a state where there is no competition against the publicly supported institutions. There was a time not very long ago when all higher education and most of what we know as secondary education were in private hands. Under the egalitarian principles of American democracy as the pressure toward the ideal of educating all American youth increased, it was inevitable that there should be increasing public support.

Consequently there grew up systems of public and of private education—partly competitive and partly complementary. Each has made its own great contribution. There is no reason for hostility or tension between them; *the public interest requires both*. But it also requires that there should be a reasonable balance between them. Monopoly, public or private, is as bad for education as for anything else.

That essential balance is not being maintained. Across the country the number of teachers employed by the public and paid from the public treasury is now vastly larger than those employed by "private" institutions. At the lower school levels the disparity is overwhelming; at the secondary level it is great and at the university level it is great and accelerating. Moreover, salaries in private institutions are falling rapidly behind those in public institutions.

This is a fact of profound relevance to our topic. If a professor derives a living wage from private sources and if his social status is reasonably comfortable, he accommodates himself to the system which gives him those satisfactions. That is why through most of our history you haven't had any complaint about radical pro-

fessors. But if a man's income is derived from the public treasury, he is in no position to object to public management. Moreover, if his salary from the public is larger than that received by professors in endowed institutions, he is going to compare private enterprise unfavorably with public management, for he is better off depending upon the public treasury and would suffer from the fluctuations of private enterprise.

If the time ever comes when all the professors in the colleges and universities of the country draw their salaries from state or federal governments, they may become critical of their working conditions, unionize and strike as the teachers have done. But they are not likely to be opponents of the expansion of governmental activities. Not being dependent on private enterprise, they will have less and less concern for the fate of the enterprise system.

Now I must shock you, for I must emphasize the fact that it is not alone the professor in publicly supported institutions who is now dependent upon public funds for his salary. Most of the larger private institutions are drawing very large parts of their budgets, indeed predominant shares of the costs of research in the sciences, from contracts with the federal government. In some institutions this figure has risen as high as 50 per cent or more. I saw a statement from one of the leading endowed institutions the other day, and 55 per cent of all of its revenue, including tuition, endowment and everything else, came from government contracts. In such circumstances many professors even in endowed institutions no longer look to endowment (that is to private enterprise) to supply the tools of their trade and meet the costs of their experiments, or even a substantial part of their salaries. They have become dependent upon federal funds.

And there is something just a little amusing in the fact that many of us are sitting near the front door with our guns cocked to keep Uncle Sam from coming in, when he came in through the kitchen door long since and is now fully established in the back part of the house and doing business at the old stand. This means, therefore, while the argument about federal support of education rages, the real subsidy has already begun and so great is the leverage of these government contracts that many privately endowed

institutions would find their programs almost crippled if those federal government contracts were withdrawn.

Professors whose livelihood and labor are not supported by private enterprise, who look to federal funds for both, are not going to resist federal "encroachment," either there or elsewhere.

Count Sforza, now again Foreign Secretary in Italy, commented bitterly during the long years of his exile upon the intellectuals who watched freedom destroyed. All those whom he denounced drew their stipends from the state; it had become their only possible source of revenue and they became subservient to the state. And I say to you in all seriousness that those who have an interest in the preservation of the enterprise system will be well advised to see to it that the private institutions are not weakened further and that government does not engulf or even dominate higher education.

This analysis was not designed as a popular approach; it is a serious effort to call attention to something of profound importance to American life. All the evidence indicates that a larger proportion of young people are to be in school for longer periods of time than ever before in the history of the world. That being so, the temper, the attitudes, and the doctrines of teachers are of vast significance. If, as I have indicated, there has been a growing breach between those who teach and our social and economic system, then it had best be understood.

The cure is not to denounce or to harry the faculties; it is to reform the situation which makes the intellectual bear the burdens without sharing the rewards. It is to recognize his strategic, indeed his vital, place in our economy, our society, and our public life and to proceed rationally and with as much light and as little heat as possible to redress the balance, and give to the teacher that which he must have.

THE LITERATURE OF POLITICAL DISILLU- SIONMENT¹

By SIDNEY HOOK

New York University

In one of his *Dialogues in Limbo*, which in profundity and suggestiveness has been compared to the dialogues of Plato, George Santayana pictures madness as a belief in the imaginary and as a desire for the impossible. Such madness he calls normal and natural. He contrasts it with the madness which, although natural, is abnormal, subject to the chastisements of Dike, the goddess of justice. Santayana's language is peculiar, flavored as it is by a sophisticated enthusiasm for the archaic metaphysics of Democritean materialism. But what he is saying is that normal illusion or madness "comes of being alive," and that to be alive is to believe in the imaginary, to cherish and pursue ideals. For a human being to be without ideals is to be inert, dead even if unburied.

Even in the eyes of the most sober of psychologists human life is a form of goal-seeking behavior. It differs from other kinds of living behavior directed to ends, in that its consciousness and knowledge of what it strives toward, however these be analyzed, make a perceptible difference to oneself and others. Ideals are as natural to man as their absence is to other animals.

All human beings begin their career by accepting the ideals of others, first by habit and then by faith. For that is what it means to live in a community. Growth and maturity consist not in abandoning ideals but in understanding them, supplementing them, and sometimes substituting other ideals for them, more securely anchored in the flux of change.

It is in terms of its dominant ideals that the basic beliefs of any

¹ An adaptation of a paper read at the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Chicago, Illinois, November 27, 1948, portions of which were published under the title, "Communism and the Intellectual," in the *American Mercury*, February, 1949.

society can be defined. What is called the crisis of *our* age, whatever else it is, is a crisis of belief—not a crisis of religious belief in the conventional sense—but a crisis of political belief in religious form. If we define religion not in terms of dogma but in terms of objects of ultimate concern, then it is indisputable that our great public religions today are political. They determine more articles of faith and belief, more objects of allegiance and devotion, than any of the traditional propositions of theology. You can infer far fewer things about a man's commitments in the way of action or belief from, e. g., his acceptance of divine existence and human immortality than you can from his acceptance of the principles of communism or fascism or democracy.

It is natural that the present intense struggle of political ideals should have caught up, in different ways, the artists and poets and novelists of our time as well as the philosophers. It is natural because of the pervasiveness of the political interest in modern culture, an interest which emerges from, and in turn modifies, the entire stream of human experience whose patterns and eddies and cross currents are the subject matter of art and reflection.

The contemporary struggle of political ideals has a long history. But it became focal and dramatic with the Russian Revolution of October, 1917, and the formation of the Soviet state. W. H. Auden, the English poet, in comparing the times of Wordsworth with our own, writes:

Like his, our lives have been coeval
With a political upheaval,
Like him, we had the luck to see
A rare discontinuity
Old Russia suddenly mutate
Into a proletarian state.

There are tremendous differences, of course, between the French and Russian Revolutions and their respective developments; and Auden would no longer refer to Russia as a proletarian state. It is undeniable, however, that the Russian Revolution has been the only historical event that has inspired in so many different fields, from philosophy to poetry, reactions of comparable magnitude to those which followed the Fall of the Bastille.

One important difference, relevant to our analysis, in the cultural responses to the French and Russian Revolutions, is the extent to which they took on a *narrow* political character. The responses that greeted the French Revolution were episodic, spontaneous, in varying degrees sympathetically *critical*, and above all *autonomous* in their subsequent development. But those evoked by the October Revolution, after the first few years, were organized, and then in divers ways moulded until their expression took the form of total acceptance.

Neither the French Assembly nor the Convention nor the Directorate nor even the Empire, which some historians view as consolidating the gains of the French Revolution, had an international organization which established political parties in other countries and channelled sympathetic cultural movements along definite lines. The Soviet regime, however, through the Communist International, organized and controlled political parties whose following provided, so to speak, the acoustic medium in which intellectuals influenced by the October Revolution could hear over and over again the echo of their own sentiments. The existence of this audience and special public was put to good use by the agencies established to effect cultural liaison between sympathetic intellectuals and the political movements inspired by the Soviet regime. Leagues of writers, associations of artists, councils of scientists, proliferated in every large country of the world. The upshot was a mobilization and concentration of intellectual talent on behalf of a political ideal unequalled in the annals of any period.

The enthusiasm generated by the October Revolution was not synthetic even though it was exploited politically to the utmost. In many cases it had the sincerity of a religious conversion. It encountered opposition, sometimes strong opposition. But it thrived on it. It produced an impressive body of literature in affirmation of the philosophy, program, and practices of the Soviet regime. This literature of affirmation was in no way unique except in volume, for the American and French Revolution, as well as the national upheavals in Italy and Germany during the 19th century, had also given rise to libraries of passionate and interpretive sympathetic studies. What seems to me to be historically distinctive about the cultural and literary phenomena associated with the

Russian Revolution is the literature of disillusionment with which the spiritual Odyssey of so many converts to the Bolshevik faith has terminated, and who now recognize with Auden:

O Freedom still is far from home
For Moscow is as far as Rome
Or Paris.

Indeed, most of them would say that Moscow is farther.

II

This literature of disillusion constitutes a distinct genre of writing in contemporary letters if only because of its international character and the common pattern of rediscovery and rededication to certain values of the Western tradition that had not been so much denied as ignored. Russell, Auden, Spender, and Orwell in England; André Gide, Souvarine and Serge in France and Belgium; Ignazio Silone in Italy; Panait Istrati in Greece; Arthur Koestler in Central Europe; Anton Ciliga in the Balkans; Eastman, Dos Passos, Wilson, Hicks, Farrell in the United States are among the more noteworthy figures who have contributed to this literature.

As literature it must be sharply distinguished from the revelations of former members of the Communist Party who were revolted, or felt themselves threatened, by the pattern of conspiracy, espionage, and subversive infiltration in which all members of the Communist Party are personally involved. I am not discussing the "professional revolutionists," but intellectuals who are concerned more with ideology than organization, and who in some ways are more influential than exclusively political personalities.

The evolution of attitudes in most of these men differs from the apostacies of Wordsworth and Dostoyevsky, whose early revolutionary enthusiasm and doctrines became transformed into their polar opposites. We do not find in their works sentiments comparable to those expressed in Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Sketches* or *Devotional Incitements*; and if their writings do not reach the great artistic heights of Dostoyevsky's bitter legend of the *Grand Inquisitor*, neither do they celebrate the central role which Dos-

tojevsky assigned to miracle, mystery, and authority in human life.

If we ask what led so many sensitive and generous spirits to ardent and sometimes sacrificial support of Soviet communism, we find a mixture of motives inexplicable in terms of the hedonistic determinism of Bentham or the economic determinism of Marxian orthodoxy. Neither self-interest nor fear nor vanity moved them to break with the conventional pieties and allegiances of the world in which they had been nurtured. In almost equal measure, they were impelled by a revulsion against the dismal spectacle of the postwar West which tottered without faith and with little hope from one crisis to another, and by an enthusiasm for the ideals of equality and human liberation broadcast in the official decrees and laws of the early Soviet regime. Both the revulsion and enthusiasm were rooted in a moral sensibility whose fibres had been fed from sources deeply imbedded in the traditions of the West. Not one of the neophytes to the Communist faith was conscious of accepting an alien creed no matter how foreign the idiom in which it was clothed. The words in which one English convert to the Soviet idea describes her road to the Kremlin holds true with minor variations for the entire band of fellow-pilgrims:

I came to communism via Greek history, the French revolutionary literature I had read in childhood, and the English 19th century poets of freedom. . . . In my mind Pericles' funeral oration, Shelley's and Swinburne's poems, Marx's and Lenin's writings, were all part and parcel of the same striving for the emancipation of mankind from oppression.¹

Stephen Spender, another English poet, in an effort to show that there is a continuity between the liberal idealists and philosophical radicals of the past century, on the one hand, and the Communists of the present century, on the other, between Blake, Godwin, and J. S. Mill and Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin, wrote:

I am a communist because I am a liberal. Liberalism seems to me to be the creed of those who, as far as it is possible in human affairs, are disinterested, if by disinterestedness one understands not mere passivity but a regard for objective truth, an active will

¹ Freda Utley, *Lost Illusion* (Philadelphia: Fireside Press, rev. ed., 1948), pp. 2, 43.

towards political justice. During an era of peace and progress, the liberal spirit is identical not only with political discussion, but also with scientific inquiry, speculative thought and the disinterested creation of works of art.¹

What Spender is saying is that he is a communist because he believes in disinterestedness, objective truth and justice, free political discussion and inquiry, and creative integrity—a cluster of values every one of which, oddly enough, has been vehemently denounced as bourgeois prejudices by the pundits of dialectical materialism ever since the early days of the Soviet regime. Spender has long since repudiated communism without forswearing his liberalism.

Compare these strains of rationalism and humanism with the *motifs* in the apologies of those adherents to German National Socialism like Rauschning, Strasser, and Thyssen, who renounced the Nazi regime. What elements in the Nazi practice and doctrine magnetized *their* minds, emotions, and will? “A national awakening,” “a surface discipline and order,” “a vast display of energy and achievement” whose new tempos and accelerated rhythms lift men out of “the humdrum of daily life”—these are some of the things of which they speak. No ideals continuous with the heritage of either secular or Christian humanism moved these men and their fellows but only the pull of the dynamism of power. Here was no attempt to achieve either a revolution from within or a transformation of basic institutions, but in Rauschning’s phrase “a revolution of nihilism.” Not principle—not even mistaken principle—drew them on, but a frenetic national enthusiasm, and a mysticism centered on the person of Hitler. “I looked into his eyes and he into mine; and at that I had only one desire, to be at home and alone with that great, overwhelming experience.” This extravagant outburst, Rauschning tells us, came not from an hysterical woman “but from a judge in a high position, talking to his colleagues.”

A candid appraisal of the literature of Nazi disillusion shows that it is qualitatively of an entirely different order from that of the erstwhile partisans of the Soviet idea. Those who broke with

¹ *Forward from Liberalism* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1937), p. 202.

Hitler did so because their stomachs were not strong enough to assimilate, as a constant diet, the atrocities to which they had originally resigned themselves as incidental and temporary—like Rauschning; or because their private interests were jeopardized by someone who they expected would be their creature because he had been bought—like Thyssen; or because their personal ambitions were frustrated—like Strasser.

I have contrasted these two types of literature of disillusion to underscore how misleading is the simple equation often drawn between Bolshevism and Nazism. In respect to their repudiation of many features of the democratic process they are, of course, identical, but in respect to the power of the Soviet and Nazi myths to attract the liberal spirits of the West they are vastly different. One need not agree with Toynbee that Russian Bolshevism is a species of Christian heresy to recognize the seductive effect of its use of categories drawn from the Western culture it would destroy. Just as the early Christians used the temples of pagan worship to make the new religion more palatable to peoples whose rulers had been converted, so the ideology of Bolshevism parades with a vocabulary of freedoms and rights freighted with connotations precious to all genuine humanists. That is why it is a more formidable opponent of free cultures than movements openly dedicated to their destruction. It is especially formidable in drawing to itself politically innocent men and women of good will and strong emotions whose minds are unfortified with relevant information, and who have not yet learned that only an intelligence hardened by skepticism is a safeguard against the credulities born of hope.

It is worthy of note that most of those who succumbed to the Soviet myth were devoid of political experience. They were led to their first political affair by emotional compulsion rather than by sober computation of the consequences of adopting a given proposal and its alternatives, which constitutes the every day life of rational politics. Just as the necessity for loving creates its own object, so the necessity for believing selects the myth that appears best fitted to one's need and hopes. And, given the cultural climate—the naiveté, the vague longing for "higher things," and the vast ignorance of political fact—what seemed more congenial than the Soviet idea, the apparent offspring of moral idealism and scien-

tific law? It not only held out guarantees of fulfillment of their highest hopes but provided a metaphysics to give them cosmic support.

All the great myths of history, from Augustine's *City of God* to Sorel's *General Strike*, have been able to sustain themselves because nowhere could they be exemplified, lived with, tested in terms of their fruits in experience. The Soviet myth of a humane, rationally ordered, classless, democratic society, however, was glorified not as an otherworldly ideal but as an historical fact with a definite locus in space and time. In staking out a claim in history, it subjected not only its power but its intent to the logic of events. We have no way of knowing the actual extent to which these who are native to the Soviet Union believe in the Soviet myth, carefully inculcated as it is in every textbook from the kindergarten to the university and reinforced by an omnipresent secret police whose forced labor camps girdle the country. But we do know, judging by the literature under review, that the first doubts in the minds of the pilgrims from other countries arose when they actually lived in the land of their dreams or pondered on the critical reports of those who had.

Some day a psychologist or poet will do justice to the drama of doubt in the mind of these political believers. Few individuals ever surrendered their belief in God with more agony, soul-searching, and inner resistance than these latter-day apostles of revolutionary brotherhood surrendered their belief in the monolithic validity of the monolithic state system.

III

It is an elementary truth of the psychology of perception that what a man sees depends often upon his beliefs and expectations. The stronger the beliefs the more they function like *a priori* notions whose validity is beyond the tests of experience. Hopes can be so all-consuming that they affect even the range and quality of feeling. The consequence is that the shocks of reality, in terms of which the natural pragmatism of the human mind experiences actuality, lose their educational office. To say that a man is seized and transformed by an abstraction is a metaphor but it ex-

presses the empirical fact that an idea-system, instead of functioning as a guide to conduct, can operate in such a way as to transform habits, feelings, and perceptions of the individual to a point where marked changes of personality are noticeable.

It was to be expected that the Western intellectuals who saw the Soviet Union firsthand would screen their impressions through the closely knit frame of doctrinal abstractions. It took some time before the cumulative shock of events tore a hole in this frame through which the facts of experience could pour. Only then did the agony of self-doubt begin. With varying details each one tells the same story. Once the evils of the system were recognized as evils, it was hoped they would disappear in time. When they grew worse with time, they were justified as necessary elements of the future good. When this necessity was challenged, the mind dwelt upon worse evils that could be found in other countries. But this provoked two gnawing questions. Were the evils in other countries really worse? And in any case, in the countries they came from, evils could be publicly criticized: why not here?

The process of disenchantment was all the harder because in the course of their original conversion so much tortured dialectic had been expended in defense of what now seemed to be indefensible. As a rule it requires more intellectual courage to renounce an illusion than to espouse one. For others are usually involved in such renunciations. These men and women felt a moral responsibility for those, and to those, who had been influenced by their enthusiasms. They knew that they would be showered with abuse, defamed as turncoats, that their former friends would construe the avowal of any doubt as evidence of personal fear or self-seeking despite the overwhelming evidence that neither popular favor nor material goods ranked high in their scale of values. They knew they faced loneliness and isolation. Bertrand Russell, the first of this group, and, as one would expect, the quickest to see through the myth, once confessed that he lost more friends by his criticism of Soviet terror than by his absolute pacifism during a war in which his country was locked in a battle for life and death with Germany.

Much graver considerations kept their lips sealed. They shrank in dismay at the prospect that reactionaries would seize upon their

criticisms for their own purposes. More important still, a practical substitute faith to which they could wholeheartedly dedicate themselves was not available to them. They had lost their belief but not their hunger for belief. The man who cries, "Lord, I believe; help thou my *unbelief*," is usually on the way to a belief in which he may find peace, but he into whose soul the more radical acids of *disbelief* have entered can never again recapture the serenity of the original belief. He has lost his innocence, and in the end, can only be useful as a party functionary.

But as excess followed excess in a bloody succession, as intolerance and internal coercion increased in direct proportion to the strength and stability of the Soviet State, they felt compelled to make public their disavowal of their former allegiance. In every case it is clear that the ultimate grounds for their disavowal were the very same moral sentiments which had originally led them to the Kremlin. It was not the state, they discovered, which had withered away but every vestige of political freedom, and with it all the brave ideals of the heroic period of the October revolution.

None of the writers of this school could honestly be called sentimental dreamers or Utopians. Most of them considered themselves Marxists of a sort. They had been trained to take a long view toward the stern necessities of history. Without swallowing Hegel they agreed with him that what appears evil is often the negative dialectical moment in a cycle of progress, or what Toynbee today calls the ever-renewed challenge, necessary for a creative response on a higher level at a later time. They therefore allowed many times over for the blunders and crudities and rough edges of a new social justice.

It is one thing, however, to explain a phenomenon historically; it is another thing to justify it. Where explanation and justification are confused, then whatever is, is right. But if whatever is, is right, condemnation of capitalism and Fascism, too, becomes meaningless wherever *they* exist, and the nerve of moral indignation, which led to belief in communism in the first place, becomes paralyzed. If history not only raises moral problems but settles them, then Gletkin's train of thought as he argues with Rubashev in Koestler's *Darkness at Noon* becomes inescapable. A mistake is a crime; successful might is always right; the weak are *ipso*

facto wrong; every lost cause is a bad cause. Such a philosophy may be professed in words, but in experience no sensitive human being can consistently act on it. That is why, for all their historical naturalism and scientific determinism, these enthusiasts were compelled to recognize that *not* everything they saw was necessary, and that some things could have been *different*.

IV

What, then, were the specific experiences which led to disenchantment with the Soviet myth? And at the outset it must be declared that it was *not* the discovery of the miserable living conditions of the Russian masses. Although they had been sadly unprepared for what they found by the extravagant claims made by Soviet partisans abroad, they found reassurance in the promises of future five-year plans. What struck them most forcibly was the *cruelty*, the unnecessary cruelty, which pervaded almost every aspect of Soviet administrative practice.

This cruelty was not sadistic or demonic as in some Fascist countries; it was systematic, a matter of state policy, carried out to teach object lessons to those who could not possibly profit by it because they were destroyed in the process. The use of bread as a political weapon was not unknown in the past, but its calculated withdrawal for purposes of insuring absolute conformity was something new. The same was true for the use of correctional labor camps for political prisoners. Ciliga, Serge, and others bitterly contrast the conditions in which political prisoners, including Lenin and his lieutenants, lived under the Czar with the conditions under which those charged with political offenses lived under Stalin. And in a nationalized economy under dictatorial controls almost any offense can be regarded as political. Even theft of a handful of grain from a collective farm, moving from one town to another, not to speak of crossing a border without proper papers, are crimes against the state and punishable as such.

This cruelty was manifest not only in bureaucratic indifference but by official reminders that mercy, charity, or pity were evidence of bourgeois decadence. According to our informants, there was a total absence of concern for the individual person, an attitude in

high official quarters and low, which regarded the lives of *human* beings as if they were so much raw material like iron, coal, and scrap to be consumed in the fires of production in order to swell the figures of output.

Of course, bureaucratic indifference to the individual case, to personal need and suffering is not a Soviet phenomenon. In some degree it is found everywhere, as these men well knew. And cruelty, where state interests appear to be genuinely threatened, could be extenuated as necessary, even if harshly and mistakenly conceived. But when it was coupled with wholesale injustice, it became unendurable to those nurtured in Western traditions. Two examples of this injustice, judging by the literature, were found especially outrageous. The first was the charge of "ideological complicity" directed against anyone whose views were similar to an individual believed guilty of any offense against the regime. Thousands were in consequence punished, sometimes by liquidation, for "ideological complicity" in the alleged act of someone they never knew or heard of. The second example which particularly exercised Koestler was the practice of holding entire families hostage for the exemplary behavior of its members. One decree provided that in the case of an individual's flight from the Soviet Union even those members of his family who had no knowledge of his act were to be "deported for five years to the remote regions of Siberia." Such sentences are served in penal work camps and are renewable by administrative decision.

As if to put a doctrinal seal upon these moral outrages and answer the unuttered protests on the lips of sympathizers, the People's Commissar for Justice proclaimed in the official organ of the Soviet regime: "In the opinion of liberals and opportunists of all kinds—the stronger a country is, the more lenient it can be to its opponents. . . . No, and again no! The stronger the country is, the mightier it is. . . . the more justified are we in taking stern measures against those who disturb our socialist construction." (*Izvestia*, No. 37, 2/12/36). Not long after, the man who wrote these words was liquidated for not being stern enough. If this was socialist humanism, those who in the name of humanism had fought against such practices in countries under the heel of Fascism could not swallow it.

Most of the excesses against which the disillusioned intellectuals of the West protested did not at first concern their own professional fields. They protested as *human beings* against the degradation imposed on other human beings; or as *socialists* against mounting inequalities of power and position which, in fact, produced new class distinctions; or as *Marxists* against the wilful disregard of objective historical conditions, and the blindness to the limits of endurance of human flesh. To all such protests came the reply, "reasons of state." Those who received this reply confess that although they could not *see* these "reasons of state," they were puzzled and confused by the retort. After all, there are so many variables in history, the future is so indeterminate, who knows with certainty what is necessary for what?

But there was one kind of persecution for which the excuse "reasons of state" could not be offered with the slightest plausibility. This was the cultural terror which raged in every field of the arts and sciences. All of these Western intellectuals lived in countries in which the slightest attempt to suppress a book or painting or a piece of music was sure to meet with fierce public opposition even when the censorship was tangential. And at the worst, restrictions affected sales, not one's freedom and not one's life. To undergo the experience of a *total* censorship and control shocked and stunned them. For it was a control not only over what was written but also over what was painted and sung, not only over political thought but over thought in philosophy and science, not only over *what* was created but also over *how* it was created—the style and manner as well as theme and content. Nothing like it has ever existed in the modern world. In making art and philosophy a matter for the police, it violated the sense of dignity and authenticity among these writers and artists and thinkers of the West. It also affronted their sense of integrity as craftsmen.

It had been hard enough for them to accept Stalin's description of the intellectual as "an engineer of the human soul." When the engineer was required, however, to build not only to another's specifications but according to technical rules and laws laid down by those who had never undergone the discipline and training of the craftsman, they felt that some kind of atavistic cultural barbarism was being forced upon them. When, on top of this, the penalties

and sanctions of refusing to knuckle under entailed, because of the state monopoly of all means of publication and communication, the withdrawal of the means of life for the independent thinker and writer and his family, and in stubborn cases deportation and death, mystification gave way to passionate revulsion.

They were mystified because of the demonstrable uselessness of these cultural purges to the declared objectives of the Soviet regime. What bearings, for example, on any declared social policy were involved in the purge of Soviet physicists and astronomers for expressing disbelief in absolute space and time, a corollary of the theory of relativity? Or the condemnation of abstraction in modern art, romanticism in the novel, formalism in poetry, and atonality in music? The decrees laid down with the awful authority of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and specifying the correct line in these fields must be read in order to realize how minutely this control extended to the very details of the arts and sciences. Or one could cite the dogmas of "Soviet biology"—a phrase reminiscent of the late unlamented "Nazi biology"—which renders taboo the Mendelian-Morgan theory of gene transmission in favor of Engel's Lamarckian notion, already disproved in his day, concerning the inheritance of acquired characters.

Not even this theory has any logical consequences of a political nature. Professor H. J. Muller, the famous American geneticist and Nobel Prize winner, who witnessed at firsthand the tragic purge of Russian biologists, has observed that one can just as well argue from the theory of inherited acquired characters that the children of the ruling classes, because of the advantages of their environment, become superior types of human beings in comparison with the children of the masses, as that any human being can be transformed by environmental changes into a genius. Needless to say both inferences are false. In insisting that the truth of a scientific theory had to be judged by its alleged social or political consequences, the Soviet regime, to the amazement of the Western intellectuals, was challenging what had become axiomatic since the time of Galileo.

There was another horrible consequence of the operation of the party line in cultural matters reported by those who observed it. Inasmuch as the line was a function of changing domestic and inter-

national conditions, it took sharp turns and shifts. Those who administered the party decrees often became the victims of subsequent decrees. Since there was a normal risk in any utterance, a greater risk in silence, and even a risk in ferreting out deviations, there resulted a frenzied effort to purchase immunity by professions of orthodoxy, displays of ferocity towards scapegoats, and glorifications of Stalin in language as extravagant as anything that can be found in the sacred literature of Byzantium. Everyone was caught up in an ever-expanding spiral of adulation and fear. It was this which moved André Gide, who had braved contumely in denouncing European colonial practices, to write after he returned from the Soviet Union: "I doubt whether in any country of the world, even Hitler's Germany, is thought less free, more bowed down, more terrorized, more vassalized."

There were other elements in the common saga of disenchantment which received varying emphasis in the accounts written by those who had awakened from their dream. Edmund Wilson felt that the apotheosis of Stalin had reached a point that the Russian people could react to him only neurotically both on a conscious and on an unconscious level.

One of the initial impulses which led these Western intellectuals to accept Communism was a strong feeling of internationalism. They thought of themselves as citizens of the world dedicated to an ideal of a universal parliament of free peoples. They looked to the Soviet Union as a fortress of a world movement to achieve this ideal. But when they saw that the road to power in Russia was imposed as a pattern for every other country they were disturbed. When they realized that socialist movements elsewhere were regarded as expendable border guards of the Soviet Union, active doubt set in. When, finally, cultural signs multiplied on all sides of aggressive Russian nationalism and pan-Slavism, when even Ivan the Terrible, and Peter the Great, were venerated as precursors of national Bolshevism, they felt themselves once more spiritual aliens. And with this, they experienced a new resurgence of kinship with the West and their own countries which until now they had seen only through a thick ideological fog.

The decay of faith led rapidly to other discoveries. One was that the rough economic equality which both Marx and Lenin

assumed as a principle of socialist distribution was as far distant in the Soviet Union—in some respects even farther away—as in the countries of the middle-way. The other was a nausea, more acute for being so long delayed, at the falsity of Soviet propaganda, its employment of semantic corruption as a weapon, illustrated, e. g., in the use of the term *democracy* for a system in which expression of dissent was a grave penal offense.

V

It would be inappropriate to conclude this survey of political disillusionment without some evaluation of the weaknesses in the outlook of these Western intellectuals which contributed to their tragic self-deception. Even granting the partial truth of their plea that it was not so much *they* who changed as the Soviet system, it still remains undeniable that they were at fault in not conceiving the possibilities of change. But much more than this can be said in criticism. Even when all allowances are made for human fallibility their responsibility for their own illusions remains heavy.

First, they looked to politics for something politics alone can never bring to the life of men—that absolute certainty, that emotional “sumptuousness of security,” to use James’ phrase, which, if attainable at all, can be most easily reached through a revealed religion they had already, and properly, rejected. In identifying themselves with those in the seats of power, they abdicated their true functions as intellectuals—to be the critical conscience of the smug and contented; and to fulfill their mission as the creatively possessed, the eternal questers after truth under all conditions. There is no loyalty to any community or state or party or church which absolves the individual from loyalty to himself. Whatever good the “saving remnant” can bring to the world, it must at least save the purity of the enkindling flame which by accident of natural grace burns within them.

Secondly, in their zeal for salvation by total political faith, they forgot that politics is always made by men, and that no doctrine or institution is a safeguard against its own abuses. They were doomed to be disillusioned because they forgot that no social change can make gods or even angels out of men, that to be human

is to be tempted, and that no one can be forever tempted without erring either out of weakness or ignorance. This is another way of saying that they were naïve and immature about human psychology.

Third, they made the mistake of all the typically *religieux* of forgetting that in the affairs of *this* world, at least, faith can never be a substitute for intelligence. The transformation of the economic order is not a single problem that can be settled by fiat, poetic or philosophical. It is a series of problems, all very difficult, requiring prolonged study, in the absence of which a talent with paint or words or tones is not a sufficient qualification. They were immature in imagining that the field of economic behavior, from which as a youth the great physicist, Planck, had withdrawn because of its difficulty, could be stormed with the weapons of moral indignation.

Fourth, they had abandoned too soon their own heritage of political democracy. They grossly underestimated the power of the self-corrective procedures of democracy to remedy, and in time to abolish, the major economic disabilities and injustices of our age. Intent upon viewing everything *else* in historical perspective, they refused to take an historical perspective to Western democracy, and to observe the substantial progress that had been made since the time Marx described the pitiful conditions of the English proletariat in *Capital*, a book so sacred to most of them that they never read it. They failed to see that, so long as the processes of political democracy remained intact, it was possible to carry the moral imperatives of the democratic way of life just as far as our courage, effort and powers of persuasion reached.

Fifth, they did not understand the genuine sense in which the social problem is a moral problem, i. e., that no social institution or system is an end in itself but a means for realizing the primary values of security, freedom, justice, knowledge, and kindness. Since the world is just as much a consequence of the means we use as of the end we profess, the end that actually comes to be depends upon the moral qualities of the means used. They had often heard that the end justifies the means but they never stopped to examine the evidence in order to see whether the means used were actually bringing the end-in-view closer or pushing it farther away.

Even if they had, it is doubtful whether they would have recognized negative evidence. For the strange fact is that despite their assurance of the scientific character of their convictions, none of them could indicate, even theoretically, what possible evidence would lead them to abandon or modify their political beliefs. Everything that happened counted as positive evidence. Until their basic attitude changed, experience could never refute what they held to be empirical truths.

Whatever the responsibility of these writers for their own illusions, the record of their disillusionment is a record of growing intellectual and emotional maturity. No one has a right to be censorious of them, and least of all those who complacently accept all social changes, whose emotions of sympathy for their fellowman are never engaged, and who leave all the risks of thought and action to others. What was possible to believe in 1919 or 1929 was no longer possible in 1939 except to the morally obtuse or corrupt. The very existence of this literature is a challenge to subsequent generations of writers who feel called to enlist themselves as foot-soldiers in a political crusade. We should be grateful to them for providing texts not only in the costs of human folly but in the grandeur of human faith and humility.

As long as there are human beings there will always be ideals and illusions. They cannot be foresworn. But perhaps the greatest lesson to which this literature points is that good sense in the quest for the good life in the good society depends not so much on *what* ideals are held as on *how* they are held; not so much on the nature of our beliefs as on the methods by which they are reached.

Underlying all other differences among human beings is the difference between the absolutist and the experimental temper of mind. The first converts its unreflective prejudices into first principles, and its shifting certitudes into a fanaticism of virtue which closes the gates of mercy against all who disagree. The second, although resolute in action, knows that finality of judgment is not possible to men, and is therefore prepared to review the evidence on which it stakes its ultimate commitments. It is this willingness to reconsider first principles in the light of relevant evidence and other alternatives which is the sign of both the liberal and the mature mind.

THE COLLEGES, THE GOVERNMENT AND FREEDOM¹

By BERNARD DE VOTO

The Honorable John McSweeney, Representative from the Sixteenth Congressional District of Ohio, has a record in Congress, elsewhere in the public service, and in two wars that entitles him to be called, like the captain of the host of the king of Syria, a mighty man in valor. But he had a day in June when he was made to feel that the resemblance did not end there. He was attending the Commencement exercises at Wooster College—besides holding two degrees from Wooster, he has taught there and served on the board of trustees—when a news story broke. Mr. McSweeney had previously been named to the House Un-American Activities Committee in a long-needed effort to clean it up. While he was renewing old college ties, the usually infallible publicity sense of his chairman, Congressman John S. Wood of Georgia, skidded off the road. Mr. Wood chose Commencement Week—with the faculties still in residence, the trustees in session, and the alumni gathered—to call on some seventy colleges to submit to his committee lists of “textbooks and supplementary reading, together with authors,” which they were using “in the fields of sociology, geography, economics, government, philosophy, history, political science, and American literature.”

Fifteen minutes after the papers were out, the assembled faculty and alumni of Wooster College had reminded Mr. McSweeney that Naaman was a leper. He got back to Washington fast, in a notable rage. He found Representatives Harold H. Velde of Illinois and Morgan H. Moulder of Missouri, and two other but unnamed members of the committee, equally haired up. Mr. Wood had sent out the request on his own, without consulting the committee. Mr. McSweeney called a power play straight through

¹ “The Easy Chair,” *Harper's Magazine*, September, 1949, No. 1192. Reprinted through the courtesy of the author and of *Harper's Magazine*.

him. He must know some high-voltage words, for presently Mr. Wood told the press that he had not intended anything sinister: his letter was just a routine check. A couple of coveys of the Sons of the American Revolution had written in that they understood some fearful things were being taught at college nowadays and he had decided to find out what the score was. Having made this explanation, Mr. Wood sent another letter to the seventy-odd colleges, saying "the committee does not desire to interfere in any manner with academic freedom nor does it intend to censor textbooks." Mr. McSweeney, I am sure, sees that his chairman's second letter had even more effrontery in it than the first one.

Mr. Wood told the papers that a lot of colleges were cooperating with him but some ignored his request and others decided that the time had come to speak out. Chancellor Day remarked that if the Un-American Activities Committee wanted to find out what Cornell was teaching, they could come to Ithaca and matriculate. President Dodds announced that Princeton would send no lists and that the request was not only a threat to academic freedom but "an intrusion by government into an area of education that ought to remain independent and not political." Other college presidents said much the same, but Dr. Lewis W. Jones of the University of Arkansas went further. He said that he would always gladly answer reasonable requests for information and, on Mr. Wood's assurance that he wasn't trying to threaten or censor anything, he would gladly send the lists asked for. That was sagacious. Arkansas is a State University and President Jones deftly put it above even Mr. Wood's suspicion before telling him that if he wanted a fight he could have one.

For he added, "in the event that Congressman Wood, as an individual official of the United States government or the House Committee on Un-American Activities, uses the information which this institution has supplied as a springboard in any attempt to interfere with freedom of thought or freedom of discussion, or to censor textbooks used in this or any other institution of learning, the University of Arkansas will resist such encroachment on the high ideal of academic freedom with every resource at its command." This freedom, he went on, is not to be surrendered at the dictate "of governmental agencies, committees, bureaus, or pres-

sure groups of any hue of political or economic philosophy," no doubt including the Sons of the American Revolution. Then he faced Mr. Wood's Satan and declared that his institution would produce unbiased instruction in the principles of communism as well as other political philosophies, confident that the nation and its college students will not be endangered "if left free to seek truth where it may lead, if left free to work out their own destiny unhampered by narrow censorship or bigoted dictates from any source, foreign or domestic. . . . There will be no thought-control on the campus of the University of Arkansas. There will be no Iron Curtain. . . . There will be no witch-hunting or book-burning either literally or figuratively."

II

The colleges have got to talk that tough and a lot tougher. The farcical content of Mr. Wood's request tends to veil the insolence and chauvinism of his action in making it. We see the naiveté of his assumption that college courses are taught from textbooks, as apparently they were at Mercer University when he was young, and we forget that he tried to usurp jurisdiction and authority which he has not got. We picture his dismay on receiving a microfilm of the Union Catalogue, which is the only way in which a university could comply with his request, and we forget that making it was an act of intimidation and intolerable arrogation. We imagine his pain on examining the listed books and finding not only Lenin, Trotsky, and inflammatory periodicals out of Russia, but revolutionary economists like John Stuart Mill and Adam Smith and revolutionary enemies of his type of mind like Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson—and we forget that he undertook to tell the nation's colleges what books he would permit their students to read.

We forget entirely too much these days. See how far we have come down the most dangerous of all paths. Two groups of perturbed men (there are many others) think it entirely natural to denounce textbooks to the Un-American Activities Committee and count on Mr. Wood to act. A Congressman thinks it entirely natural to call on the colleges to account for themselves to his

committee. Doubtless some of his zeal stems from an effort that explains much of our Red scare, the effort of many Southern Senators and Representatives to find expedients that will help sidetrack the Administration's civil rights program. But he actually assumes that his committee has the right and power to hold the colleges to account, to control their teaching, to forbid them to use books the committee may disapprove, to shape their procedures according to its notions, to deny them access to some ideas, and therefore to commit them to the support of other ideas at the committee's will. The assumption is implicit in his first letter and overt in his explanation that, honest, folks, he never really meant to censor books or interfere with academic freedom.

Well, he isn't going to because as yet he can't. He has the power to subpoena but no one will know whether he can subpoena books until some college forces the court to decide. But no part of the government has any power, express or implied, constitutional, statutory, or as yet usurped to control the educational procedures of the colleges. The government cannot forbid any teacher or any college to deny any book to any student, though Mr. Wood is evidence that Congress, in the person of at least one member, is willing to try. The colleges should force the issue right now: by next month they will have lost more ground. Any college that has "cooperated" with him has acquiesced in a dictatorial political assault on the freedom which is the only warrant that democratic education will continue in the United States. So has a college that has merely ignored his request.

Their cooperation is fully as ominous as Mr. Wood's foolish but despotic assumption. At the moment the colleges are our agents in the defense of the key principle of democratic society. To forbid a student to read any book is to make mandatory any other book a committee may select, and if Congress can suppress the free inquiry of college students, then it can break the freedom of discussion guaranteed by the Bill of Rights with any five to four vote it cares to make. There is nothing to do except to draw a line right here and tell the government that it cannot cross the line. It is, after all, our government. But instead of drawing the line, standing on it, and crying a rescue to all honest men, the colleges have already given away much they should have held on to.

Professor Dwight E. Dumond of the University of Michigan, addressing the Mississippi Valley Historical Society: "What must we say about [the Mississippi Valley] which permits its college faculties and students to be proscribed, dismissed, and silenced on the great questions of the day...when [a large university] will permit its students to organize political clubs but will not permit them to bring in outside speakers for public meetings, and a college will dismiss a...faculty member because he supported the candidacy of Henry Wallace...and students cannot form clubs, associations, or organizations without permission? What we must say is: that until every Teachers Oath law is repealed; and every Board of Regents is told that it cannot interfere with the inalienable rights of free discussion by faculty and students, in the classroom and out, on the campus and off; and every college and university comes up to the high standards...where free discussion is not only permitted but encouraged—until that time...man's eternal fight for freedom is dangerously compromised." There is no other stand the colleges can take, and no safety for any of us until they take it, but they are almighty slow.

III

The military services are spending millions of dollars on research in the colleges not only in atomic physics but in many other fields of science, some of them wholly "pure," in the scientific meaning of that adjective. There is a growing suspicion, which a lot of us would like aired, that the generals and admirals are demanding and being accorded the right to determine the political (and what other?) opinions of the scientists whose salaries they are paying. If they are not making that demand now, we can be quite sure they will be tomorrow. Well, we are now beginning to subsidize college and university education with federal funds. Is there some idea that when the government pays the piper it will not try to call the tune? Mr. Wood is evidence that it is prepared to try, and in fact the very nature of government makes sure it will try. There is nothing we can do except to make political dictation impossible in advance. The colleges must refuse, deny, denounce, counterattack—and right now, not next year.

If Mr. Wood by himself or the Sons of the American Revolution working through him can keep Lenin off a reading list, either the chiropractors or the American Medical Association can lobby any books off any list and decree that only such medical ideas as they approve shall be taught. Mr. Wood perceives that there are threats in history, geography, and literature as well as in the dangerous sciences which occasionally imply criticism of Congressional procedures. But the moment there is a Republican majority in the House Mr. Wood's favorite political thinker can be forbidden students. (Howell Cobb, perhaps, a lifelong revolutionist who in the end committed what a majority of Americans considered treason?) If Massachusetts dislikes classroom discussion of states' rights, if Nevada wants its rainfall statistics protected from inquiry, if California wants Upton Sinclair, the Los Angeles death rate, or the fall of the water-table closed to research, any of them need only start its Congressman trading votes. No seminar on John C. Calhoun or the Essex Junto at Amherst and you can have my vote for the dredging of Goose Creek; Yale has the speeches and messages of Franklin D. Roosevelt on the reading list for Government 106, remember that and to hell with Yale when the appropriations bill comes up. It will be just that simple. The last time we had a big Red scare a man was convicted of sedition on the sole ground that he had publicly distributed copies of the Declaration of Independence. The colleges can be forbidden to expose their students to so much as its preamble, if they do not make sure that Mr. Wood's writ shall not run on the campus.

They have got to stop the government short right now, that is, if they are not to become bondservants of Congress or in fact of any single Congressman who can swing a majority in the Committee on Rules, Appropriations, Ways and Means, or Un-American Activities. If they abandon as much as one book to Mr. Wood they may as well throw in their hand. They will defy any government control of inquiry whatsoever, or they will be forced to submit to any political dictation, any limitation of academic freedom, and any coercion of academic procedure as a committee majority may care or may be induced to impose. There is no such thing as a partial virgin. There is no such thing as academic freedom that is just a mite restricted. The colleges are entirely free or they are

not free at all. Mr. Wood's absent-minded asininity was no more innocent than a tidal wave. It means that the colleges have got to make the fight. It can be won—but not unless it is made.

June indicated that the colleges are going to make the fight. But they have already lost the battle of the outposts, and have lost it by voluntarily retreating from a position of great strength. Even President Jones. He attached to his defiance of Congressman Wood a statement that the University of Arkansas "will not tolerate Communists on its faculties." If I can judge by what other college presidents said during Commencement Week, that line, which is a considerable distance back of the outposts, is the one which the colleges expect to defend. They are accustomed to look to Harvard for guidance in matters involving academic freedom. They got it in June, when Harvard published a brilliant reassertion of the eternal principles, written by Mr. Grenville Clark of the Corporation. It was unequivocal and President Conant took care to back it up in a Commencement Week speech. But Mr. Conant made an exception: "card-holding members of the Communist Party are out of bounds as members of the teaching profession." Presumably Harvard will not have them on its faculty, although Mr. Conant binds it not to inquire into the political views of its teachers and not to tolerate investigation of their loyalty or review of their private activities. No restriction of freedom but no Party members on the faculty.

IV

The reasoning is persuasive: Party members have not got free minds and so cannot share the free inquiry and the free exchange of ideas that are the essence of education. But the card is not likely to fall out of its holder's pocket while he and the dean are preparing an answer to Congressman Wood. So just how is a college going to know whether Professor X holds a card? Ultimately there will be no way except to submit to, or conduct, precisely the loyalty investigations, reviews of private activities, and inquiries into political opinion that Mr. Conant has committed Harvard to oppose. If Professor X holds a card he is quite willing to lie, which makes President Conant's stand futile, but there is no

way of determining whether he is lying except by making that same stand a formal lie. What can any college president do when the Un-American Activities Committee or anyone else, in or out of the government, phones him to say that Professor X is a card-holding member of the Party? He can say, "I'm not interested," and hang up. Or he can start out on a course that will eventually bring in the FBI. Already one leading university whose president has denounced the witch-hunt has been publicly accused of having consulted the FBI before making certain faculty appointments, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's denial fell short of convincing at least me. Is there any other way out? If a college is to protect the freedom by which alone it exists in the tradition of democratic education, it has got to run the risk. The full risk.

It is a risk: Communists on the faculty may indeed work to achieve their ends, which include the destruction of democratic education and all other freedoms. I think, the United States has always thought, that the risk is small if, in Jefferson's words, reason (with which the colleges are principally concerned) is left free to combat error. But the life of the mind has always been full of dangers, and even if this is a very great one, it must be accepted as the indispensable condition of free inquiry. The colleges cannot maintain anyone's freedom unless they insist on protecting everyone's. To except anyone is to loose on us evils and dangers incomparably worse than the one they are trying to avert. They have got to say: on this campus all books, all expression, all inquiry, all opinions are free. They have got to maintain that position against the government and everyone else. If they don't, they will presently have left nothing that is worth having.

SOME REFLECTIONS CONCERNING UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION¹

By JOHN DALE RUSSELL

United States Office of Education

Administration is a specialized field of activity, one that demands an unusual combination of personality, preparation, and native ability. The talent for administration is not evenly or widely distributed, and its scarcity, according to economic law, results in a higher price for it than for other abilities which are not so rare.

Some would deny that administration is a specialized field of work, pointing out that it is not an activity for which individuals prepare through a long, rigorous course of study. Professional training, such as is given the lawyer or the physician, is not required of those who aspire to administrative positions in universities. Most of those who hold such positions have learned their techniques only by experience, by practicing on the job—often an uncomfortable process for those who are administered. Increasingly, however, formal preparation for administrative service is being made available, and is being sought by a growing number of those who engage in institutional executive work.

Administration is hard work, and the hours of service are usually long in the daily and weekly schedule. It is common to find the lights burning in the administrative offices long after they have been turned out elsewhere on the campus. Administration is a soul-wearying process. The making of difficult and complex decisions is one of the very hardest kinds of work.

II

Certain principles of administrative organization and procedure

¹ Address on the occasion of the first Faculty-Trustee Dinner at Pennsylvania State College on May 13, 1949. These dinner meetings will be sponsored annually by the Chapter of the Association to promote improvements in the relations of faculty and board of trustee members and to provide information to both groups on problems of university administration.

have been formulated out of experience in observing the operations of colleges and universities. Five of these will be stated and elaborated to show their application in institutions of higher education.

Principle number one concerns *institutional integrity*. The college or university should operate as a single organization, with definite unity in its program. The university type of organization nearly always develops strong centrifugal forces that tend to destroy the integrity of the institution, to cause it to fly apart into a series of unrelated and unintegrated units. In academic circles, as in most other walks of life, there are many highly capable people who think they can be happy and effective only when they run their own show. They want to operate with little or no reference to other parts of the organization. They want to build empires. Extreme departmentalism is a common manifestation of this tendency in colleges and universities.

The recent unprecedented expansions in the size of colleges and universities have created great strains on institutional integrity. As an organization expands, it tends to become decentralized, to diffuse its objectives, to develop unrelated or even conflicting programs, and eventually to find common centers of interest for its personnel only in the most superficial aspects of its program, such as the support of a football team. At such a stage it is necessary to decide whether there is to be one institution, or two, or even a half dozen or more.

If an institution is to operate effectively as a single organization, it must have an essential unity. This implies that there must be adequate recognition, among all the operating personnel, of certain commonly recognized objectives and methods of procedure. To maintain this essential unity in objectives and procedures, without handicapping worthy and useful programs that are always being developed by individualists on the staff, is one of the most difficult and yet one of the most significant tasks of administration.

A second principle is *the separability of policy-making and executive action*. Although both are involved in administration, they occur at different phases of the operational cycle. It is helpful to recognize them separately.

Policy-making can usually be shared widely within the group that

is concerned with the operation of a program. In fact, wide sharing in policy formation is nearly always essential to a happy organization and to optimal morale in the staff. Unless those who have to carry out the policy after it is formulated, or who have to live with its results, have shared in its making, they cannot be either intelligent or enthusiastic about discharging their individual responsibilities under the policy or in accepting the results that follow from its application. They will best know how to carry out the policy after they have gone through the process of helping formulate it. They will defend the policy vigorously and accept its results cordially, if they feel that they helped originate it. Otherwise, lip service only is given the plan or regulation, and it is accepted only in a perfunctory or routine manner.

In contrast with policy-making, the execution of policy (which means its application in particular situations) often cannot be shared widely. Usually an executive action can best be taken by one person. Execution almost always involves the power to command. In every situation in which the activities of two or more people are directed toward a common end, there has to be some element of command and coordination. If two men are trying to lift a big rock, one of them has to say "Now" so that they may exert their strength at the same time and in the same direction. When commands come from a variety of sources, confusion is certain to result.

The act of command, or the giving of an order, is often resented by those to whom it is directed, particularly when the reason for the order is not understood. But when the giving of an order is preceded by a share in the making of the policy out of which it originates, then the necessity and the bearing of the order is understood, and it can be complied with intelligently and enthusiastically.

A third principle differentiates *the line and staff relationship in administration*. These different relationships are perhaps most clearly exhibited in the military organization. The chain of command provides a line relationship by which each person in the organization is responsible to some one above him, and has authority over one or more persons below him. In every situation the soldier knows to whom he is responsible, and for what. He knows from whom his orders are to come, and to whom he may give com-

mands. Orders originate in and are transmitted through the channels of the line of command.

The military system also has a staff organization at every level of command. The need for a staff and for staff functions arises from the fact that a commanding officer cannot be all wise. He must have some means of broadening his knowledge in every situation, to obtain the greatest wisdom in reaching decisions. To meet this need a staff is provided, usually composed of members of the organization who have certain specialized knowledge or talent. The commanding officer makes a decision about a military operation only after the whole situation has been thoroughly discussed in the staff. The detailed plans are drafted, criticized, and put into final form by the staff. The orders that are then issued come from the commanding officer, but they represent his concurrence in the decisions of the staff.

The line officer remains clearly and definitely responsible for giving the orders and for seeing that they are executed. If he thinks a decision of the staff is unwise, he can disregard it—but always at his peril. Such cases normally are infrequent; any considerable number of them inevitably results in either a change of the personnel of the staff, or a change in the commanding officer, or both.

Staff functions parallel the line functions at every level of command. In general, the higher the level of command, the larger the staff and the greater the demands for unusual competence in its personnel. Staff members are quite commonly chosen from those who also hold responsibilities in the line of command at a level below that in which they serve in a staff capacity. Thus the staff of a division commander will consist in large part of selected line officers from the regiments and battalions that make up the division. After completing the staff work on a particular project or operation, these officers return to their regular posts in the line of command, and assist in carrying out the orders when they come through. At the higher levels of command the staff usually also contains specialists who devote their entire time to staff functions.

The concept of line and staff relationships is directly applicable to university organization, though the functions are often somewhat confused in the academic situation. One of the most troublesome

questions in college and university organization concerns the extent and kind of authority to be exercised by the faculty as a group. A paradox appears in the term "faculty control," for the line authority descends from the board of trustees, to the president, to the dean, to the department head or chairman, and finally to the individual faculty member, who seems to correspond to the buck private in the rear rank. Yet there is general agreement that the faculty, organized as a group, should have authority which the president, dean, and department chairman must heed. The resolution of this paradox lies in the concept of the faculty groups as holding staff relationships to the line officers in the university. The entire teaching staff of the university, or possibly certain selected members of it, comprise the staff for the president and other officers of central administration. Similarly the faculty members of a given college provide a staff for the dean.

The combined wisdom of a faculty group on any problem affecting academic affairs is undoubtedly large. As a group, the faculty quite properly has the function of giving advice to the appropriate administrative officers, preparing legislation, and recommending policies, rules and regulations. Then orders are issued by the executive officer in accordance with these staff-determined policies. There should be opportunity for the responsible executive officer to differ with his staff, and to assume full responsibility for the consequences of such a decision. Normally such a situation should arise rarely and should involve only relatively minor or inconsequential issues. If it happens often, or if it involves some crucial matter, a change is indicated in either the staff personnel or the executive officer, usually the latter.

Because the same personnel usually serve in both the line and the staff capacity in a college or university, confusion often occurs in the relationship. It is important for each responsible person to recognize, in every action taken, whether it is done as an executive officer or as a staff member. The two kinds of responsibility are quite different, and to confuse them is certain to result in bad administration.

A fourth principle, that is closely related, demands that there be *equation between the authority and the responsibility assigned any person* on the staff. No person should be assigned responsibility

for a particular job unless he is given authority to command the means to get it done. Conversely, no person should be given authority unless he is to be held responsible for results. Both authority and responsibility should be clearly and definitely placed. Each person must know exactly for what he is responsible and the precise range of his authority.

The principle of equation between authority and responsibility meets perhaps its greatest test in the position of the president of a university. In the popular mind there has been built up a concept which assigns great prestige and responsibility to the president of a college or university. When a group of educators assembles on the stage before an audience, the big middle chair naturally goes to the university president, if there is one in the group. The general public tends to hold the president responsible for all that goes on in the university—it is so easy to say, "in *his* university." But the fact, as is well known to all faculty members, is that the president has relatively little direct authority over the really crucial operations of the institution. He cannot tell the faculty members what to teach in their classes, or how to teach them. He cannot control the requirements for either admission to the institution or graduation from it. Presidents have been known to complain bitterly that the extent of their responsibility is much greater than their authority to command the means for discharging that responsibility.

The lack of equation between the authority and the responsibility of the university president constitutes a dilemma in American higher education. If the president takes a serious view of his responsibilities, and seeks to enlarge his authority so that he may carry them out successfully, the faculty group is at once antagonized and is usually able to resist encroachment on its time-honored prerogatives. The other alternative, involving a resolute attempt to disabuse the public mind of its faulty conception about the power and prestige of the president's office, seems not to have been tried very much, though it would seem to offer the possibility of bringing responsibility and authority more nearly into equation.

Some student of social psychology could make an interesting contribution by an investigation to discover just how and why it is that the notion of the university president as a person of great prestige has been built up in the public mind. Possibly he stands

out only as a symbol, attracting the respect and reverence that the uninitiated display toward the mysteries of higher education. Perhaps Ralph Waldo Emerson is partly responsible for the popularization of the "great man" concept of the university president, because of the oft-quoted statement to the effect that the institution "is but the lengthened shadow of one man." This aphorism might have been appropriate in Emerson's time, but it cannot be true very often today, owing to the large size of the universities and the increased general competence of their faculties. A "lengthened shadow," if the metaphor may be pushed that far, is characteristic of the period just after sunrise or just before sunset; no respectable university would like to acknowledge that it is in such a stage of its history today. The modern university is much more than the lengthened shadow of one man; nevertheless the general public probably still retains this erroneous conception of the rôle of the university president.

Finally there is the principle of *competence*, which requires that duties and responsibilities be assigned where they can be discharged most effectively. Sometimes this requires the placing of a function with some one person or official; for other functions the greatest competence will be in a group of persons. For example, evaluation of transcripts of students seeking to enter a university can usually best be assigned to a single office, where the person or persons skilled in the interpretation and evaluation of student records can pass judgment on each case. If such a function is widely diffused, it will normally be performed less competently than when it is centered in a single office. As another illustration, purchasing is a highly specialized skill at which people, after training and experience, become expert. It is better to have all purchasing done for an institution in a central purchasing office, staffed by experts, than to have every faculty member doing the buying of the things he needs to carry on his own projects. As a third illustration, the question may be asked as to where the greatest competence for dealing with curriculum matters is to be found. This type of competence exists principally among the scholars on the faculty, and involves many specialized areas of subject matter. No one man today could possibly have sufficient knowledge to comprehend the whole scope of human learning that is involved in a university curriculum. So

almost every institution places the responsibility for the control of its curriculum in the hands of the entire faculty. The principle of assigning duties and functions where the greatest competence exists is very important in the division of labor involved in operating a modern university.

Five guiding principles have been mentioned for university administration. Others might have been suggested but these seem to be among those most important for the effective operation of an institution of higher education.

III

The business of administering a university requires leadership. How to get leadership in a democratic society is a problem that has not been fully solved. In a totalitarian state or in a society accustomed to dictatorship, the problem of leadership seems simple. In spite of this advantage, most of us still prefer our democracy. To the extent that our universities reflect our belief in a democratic society, they share in the hazards of obtaining suitable leadership.

There are various kinds of leaders that emerge in higher education. It may be well to look at some of the different categories.

One type of so-called leader follows the policy of waiting to see in what direction events are going to turn. When that becomes clear, he jumps out in front with a sudden show of interest and insight, waves his arms, and says, "Come on, boys, follow me." This is the bandwagon type of leader. Usually he does not fool very many people for any considerable period of time.

Another type of leader, who scarcely deserves that designation, believes simply in letting matters take their course without giving them any direction. He merely attends to routine duties in his office, makes speeches full of well-worn clichés and platitudes, and suggests or does nothing new. This "do-nothing" or laissez-faire type of leadership typically results in stagnation and decay in the organization under its influence.

Another type of leader is obsessed by his own high estimates of his abilities. He believes that he and he alone has the ultimate knowledge and insight regarding any situation. Like the old Hebrew prophets, he might preface every pronouncement by "Thus

saith the Lord." He believes in laying down the law and expects everyone to act in accordance with his dictates. He is impatient with his dull-witted associates, who do not seem to think as fast as he does, or who do not see situations as clearly, or make decisions quickly enough. So he develops the habit of deciding everything himself and expecting his commands to be followed without question.

One reason why this autocratic type of leader is so often found in college and university executive positions probably lies in the two sources from which such officers are frequently drawn: college faculties and the ministry. In both of these lines of work the development of the "great man" complex is encouraged. The minister is accustomed to speak on any and all questions with divine authority behind him, so he expects all others to follow his word. A faculty member often is tempted to appear before his students as a "great man" filled with all wisdom. Have they not paid tuition fees to sit at his feet? He speaks with great authority on any and all questions. He expects his students to write his precious words down in their notebooks and to give them back to him on examination day. When he moves from the classroom or the pulpit into the executive office, it is difficult for him to change his habits and attitudes. Often he merely transfers them from his students or parishioners to his colleagues. Fortunately, all college teachers and ministers are not of the type just described, and by no means do all of the autocratic type of teachers and ministers eventually become college and university executive officers.

But there are other types of leaders in American universities. Particularly important is the type of leader who develops the educational approach. He may see what ought to be done, but he takes time to teach his associates and colleagues, so that the decisions emerge as a result of an educational process. This type of leader likes to plant ideas, often slyly here and there in occasional conversation. Then he watches these ideas as they develop and are passed on to other people. Finally, one of the ideas comes back to him in the form of a definite suggestion. With that his face lights up, he pats the proponent on the back, and says, "That's a wonderful idea. How did you happen to think of it? That is something we ought to get behind. We should have a committee to push it.

Suppose you accept membership on a committee and let's start to work at once." This type of leader may not enjoy the reputation of being such a "great man," but in the long run he produces more and better results than any of the autocrats.

Another type of leadership, often found combined with the "educational approach," believes in research as a means of obtaining information necessary for solving problems and making decisions. This type of leader says, "Here is a problem. I confess that my own wisdom is not sufficient to deal with it fully and properly. Let us get the facts. Let us experiment a little. What literature is available on the subject, and what are the findings of experiments on similar problems?" In this manner pertinent information may be assembled in such a way as to bring conviction about a desirable course of action to all who have anything to do with the problem.

Modern leadership increasingly uses the "group dynamics" approach. This means simply the process of getting the people concerned with the problem together to discuss it thoroughly and eventually to arrive at a consensus. In the group dynamics process, no one person or small group of persons assumes authority; nobody acts as a source of all wisdom; answers must come from the group.

The group dynamics method is most effectively coupled with the research approach, to which reference has been made in a preceding paragraph. No one can have much respect for the type of group discussion and decision that involves merely getting some ignorant people together and allowing them to talk to each other. They are all just as ignorant after their discussion as they were before. Indeed, they may have added to their ignorance because each of them may have learned something of the others' mistaken ideas. But when groups are provided with available facts and information and when they discuss analytically, objectively, and open-mindedly the problem that is before them, the conclusions have a high probability of being valid.

The group dynamics process necessarily assumes that the groups are open-minded or "educable" on the problem under consideration. This condition is not always fully satisfied in situations involving university faculty and administrative personnel.

Only a little observation of the autocratic type of leadership, the

kind that rules by executive fiat, will convince one that the practitioners of this type of leadership lack a fundamental belief in either education or research. What an anomaly it is to find the autocratic administrator in charge of a university, neither utilizing nor believing in the processes of education and research, when all the objectives and operations of his institution are directed toward these ends! Such an executive would, of course, *say* that he believes in research. He would point to the fact that the annual budget carries a large item for research, and that his institution has done much by research methods to improve the breed of beef cattle or to stop the ravages of some disease. The idea that problems of organizing, administering, and operating a university are also subject to the research approach has probably never entered his head. In fact, research on such subjects is not particularly respected among scholars on the faculty whose research interests lie in other lines of subject matter.

Similarly, the autocratic leader does not follow the principle of influencing behavior through the teaching process; he believes in having people obey orders, rather than in having them reach an understanding as to why a particular action is necessary. An administrator who has a desirable course of action to carry out should be able to bring his colleagues to his point of view by using effective teaching methods, rather than by relying on executive commands to attain his goal.

The American university has begun to swing toward a more democratically organized pattern of administration than formerly characterized it. The 19th century was probably the period when the "great man" type of leader was most widely prevalent in American higher education. During that period, most colleges and universities were dominated by a central figure, the president, and the faculty members served more or less as errand boys of the chief administrative officer. During the past three or four decades, however, institutions seem to have swung rather sharply from the autocratic type of administration to a pattern in which there is a much greater sharing in the formation of policy and a wider diffusion of responsibilities throughout the staff. It is significant that the era of greatest progress in American higher education coincides

with the period when the faculty was being given increased authority and responsibility.

Currently there is another important movement in which the functions of policy-making are being more widely shared. Increasingly the student group is being recognized as a useful agency for participation in institutional control and management. By every test this is a further step in the direction of democratic organization. Certainly the students are vitally concerned with the processes of their own education. Many institutions have found that their students are valuable sources of suggestions for improvement. A belief in the fundamental principles of democratic organization requires that not only faculty members but also the students be given a suitable voice in the determination of institutional policy.

IV

Every institution needs to give periodic attention to its administrative structure and functions. Administrative organization is not something that can be set up once and for all, with the idea that ever after it will run smoothly. Particularly as an institution expands, new stresses and strains are thrown on its administrative structure, requiring revision and remodeling. Quite commonly an institution that has a faulty organization will refuse to consider any changes, for fear that they will be upsetting and may make matters worse instead of better.

A story appropriate to the situation has its setting in England during the old days when there were annual hiring fairs in the rural districts. This was a sort of combination of county fair and employment agency, attended by the men and girls who wished to hire out for the coming year and by the farmers and their wives who were looking for help. To one of these fairs a farmer came rather early in the day, and found only one man in the hiring hall. He asked the man, "Are you available for hiring?" and the answer was, "Yes." Then, after the usual question, "What can you do?" instead of an answer along typical lines such as "I can draw a straight furrow, I can drive a four-horse team. . . ." etc., the man simply said, "I can sleep of a stormy night." "Well," said the

farmer, "I never saw a hired man who did not want to sleep all the time, anyhow." Privately he drew the conclusion that the fellow was very queer and probably would not be suitable for hiring, so he went away on other business and did not return until late in the afternoon. By that time all the men who were for hire had been employed, except this same queer fellow whom he had seen early that morning. Apparently no one had wanted a hired man whose only recommendation was that he could "sleep of a stormy night." Once more the farmer asked the fellow what he could do. Again, the only response was, "I can sleep of a stormy night." The farmer had to have somebody to work on his place, so he decided to take a chance and employed the man, and took him home with him. Strangely enough the man turned out to be rather competent, and showed no further signs of the queerness that was observed at the hiring fair. The farmer had forgotten completely about the man's lack of self-recommendation, when one night there came a terrifically heavy rain, with lightning and thunder and a strong wind. Awakened by the noise, the farmer called to the hired man who was sleeping in the attic room. Even two or three calls failed to get any response, so the farmer pulled on his boots and his coat and rushed out into the barnyard. First he ran to the main barn, expecting to find the big doors blown off, but instead he found them shut tight and latched. Then he dashed over to the henhouse thinking that the chickens would all be drowned. The henhouse was closed and the chickens were all safely inside. Finally he hurried over to the shed, remembering the new tools which he did not want to have rusted by the rain. The tools were all inside the shed and it was securely closed. Suddenly he recalled the hired man's description of himself, "I can sleep of a stormy night." The farmer looked up into the driving rain and said, "Thank God for a man who can sleep of a stormy night."

Stormy nights come all too frequently in the history of institutions of higher education. An unsatisfactory administration may continue to work reasonably well during sunny days and starry nights. It usually functions well only in a time when there are no unusual strains, and only because the staff members who happen to be associated in the organization are mutually agreeable and capable. The people who are accustomed to the organization say,

"Why change? The system may have weaknesses but we are getting along all right." Then comes a stormy night, when it is evident to all that something has to be done. Changes, which could have been made without much difficulty when the skies were serene, then become seriously disrupting to the peace and welfare of the institution. Every faculty member, every executive officer, every trustee, can well ask himself, with reference to his own institution's administrative structure, "Will I be able to sleep of a stormy night?"

Rondeau for a Faculty wife

"Faculty wife," to students known
Perhaps as cook, or chaperone—
I know there's lots of fun in you
And common sense enough for two
In ways of loving kindness shown.
I gave some things that others own
That I might claim your troth alone
As mine. You hearten me anew,
Faculty wife!

Could man express a love full-blown,
I'd praise your worth in solemn tone—
You do so well the things you do.
How do you smile so brightly through
Those horrid tasks you can't postpone,
Faculty wife?

—WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ
Stanford University

THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST OF TODAY— A REPLY

By WILLIAM H. COLE

Rutgers University

Mr. Garbuny's first paragraph in his "The Social Scientist of Today,"¹ leads one hopefully to expect a sound discussion of the social scientist of today. But the second sentence of the second paragraph destroys the expectation by falsely asserting that the discrepancy between the success of the natural sciences and the lack of success of the social disciplines "stems from the difference in the objectives and methods of the two." The basic reasons why the social sciences have not been as successful as the natural sciences are not even mentioned, namely, that their subject matter is much more difficult to study, and sound methods of study have not always been used. The latter reason is partly the result of the false assumption made by Mr. Garbuny, that somehow, some way, knowledge of man's behavior as a social animal is different from other kinds of knowledge. Paradoxically, however, persons who make that false assumption, after long round-about arguments, finally conclude that the social sciences should be studied in the same careful way that the natural sciences are studied. So, Mr. Garbuny ends his article by suggesting that both fields should become symbiotic. He forgets that symbiosis exists only where two essentially similar systems (living) divide up the day's work between them. If the two systems had different objectives and employed different methods they could never be symbiotic.

The author makes the second mistake by inferring that, because the natural scientist investigates "the physical phenomena of the universe," and does "complicated and very difficult research," and because his job "ends" with wresting "secrets from nature" and harnessing "the forces of nature," the social scientist does not do

¹ Siegfried Garbuny, "The Social Scientist of Today," *Bulletin*, American Association of University Professors, Winter, 1948, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 711-718.

those things, but does something quite different. Actually, of course, the social scientist does deal with the secrets and forces of nature, but his problems are more involved and therefore more difficult to solve. It may be predicted that any intelligent person having had a certain prescribed training can be a successful natural scientist. The rules of his game are well formulated and easy to follow, provided the jargon is memorized. The social scientist, on the other hand, has a much more difficult job because he must deal with many more variables than the natural scientist is allowed to, and because his methods must be continually modified to suit the problem being studied.

In Section II of the article Mr. Garbuny labors the point that the social scientist studies living man. Doesn't the biologist study living organisms? And are not living organisms always in a "tumult" or ever-changing state? Does not the modern atomic physicist study ever-changing systems? If he didn't, the atomic bomb would never have been discovered. Of course, studies of man as a social animal are more involved and more difficult than studies of man or other organisms as individuals, but the differences between the subjects of investigation and the methods are not qualitative. They are quantitative only. Furthermore, Mr. Garbuny's statement that "findings in the social sciences comparable to the measurements in the natural sciences are from the very beginning only of conditional validity" infers that findings in the natural sciences are not of "conditional validity." This of course is entirely false. Some of the most spectacular recent findings in several fields of biology, chemistry, and physics have proved beyond all doubt that their validity is conditional. Natural science is not static and in a "rest position" as the author leads the reader to believe. Evidently he was thinking only of isolated fields of formal mathematics and classical mechanics.

Again Mr. Garbuny's illustration of lightning not having "different causes in this country from those in the U.S.S.R." is inept, since it leads the reader to another false inference. Human brains in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. are the same and operate according to the same laws. Expressions of the mind may differ markedly in the two places, but those differences can be understood if the psychologists, the historians, sociologists, and the political scientists

correctly investigate and interpret the different environments: physical, social, political, and spiritual. Such investigations, if properly done, will be carried on by "detached" observers and analysts, in no way basically different from investigation in the subjects of physics, chemistry, and biology.

The second paragraph of Section II repeats the false ideas in different words. To infer that "understanding" is needed only by the social scientist, not by the natural scientist, is absurd. To infer again that the social scientist wants to know about the "rules of the game," but the natural scientist doesn't, is naïve. What makes the rules governing man's social behavior seem "not permanently fixed" is ignorance of them, just as ignorance deceived some physiologists of a hundred years ago into saying that animal functions could never be satisfactorily studied and analyzed because of their complexity. Today we know how wrong they were. Natural scientists today accept the challenges of complexity and dynamic change, and attack problems that would have been considered hopeless a few decades back.

The only way to induce young people to study social science is to show them that knowledge of their subject is no less respectable than knowledge of any other subject; that problems of social science are no less susceptible to attack than problems in natural science, even though some of the former may be more difficult than the latter; and that the world needs such knowledge just as much as it needs other kinds of knowledge.

Similar viewpoints are expressed in different words by Professor Miller in his recent note in *Science*, Vol. 109, p. 290, March 18, 1949, entitled, "Scientific Method and Social Problems."

THE LABOR GOVERNMENT: AN APPRAISAL

By WALTER C. RICHARDSON

Louisiana State University

England at the close of the war was confronted with a threefold problem: recuperation from the exhaustion, at once physical, moral, and economic, of the war years; recovery of her prewar economic position, in which emergency measures are necessary to bridge the widening gap between imports and exports; and an *external* financial crisis, which involves an adverse balance of trade, a serious overseas deficit, and a dollar shortage no longer offset by adequate markets in the sterling areas.

The first of these problems was further complicated by a growing conviction of a disillusioned, war-weary people that the old Britain was passing and a new era was upon them, that if a "new Britain" was to succeed, the older conservative forces in politics and industry must give way to the more liberal ideals of a planned economy. This national desire, as interpreted by the socially-minded and more articulate intellectuals, found political expression in the repudiation of the Conservative Party program in the national election of July, 1945. By an overwhelming majority of popular support the Labor Party was given its first real mandate by the country to put into practical operation the theoretical aims and objectives of a "socialist" movement that had been slowly crystallizing in England for over half a century. From a purely objective point of view it is perhaps unfortunate that the most significant political and economic experiment that Britain has undertaken in the twentieth century should be launched during the critical postwar years of national recovery; rather, it were preferable that the new regime should stand or fall on its own merits and not be dependent, as is presently the case, upon so many ulterior factors—such as increased exports and unprecedented goals of higher production, or optimistic party pledges—which are only indirectly related to the basic principles of the social state. In

fact, the ultimate success of the Labor program is, in large part, bound up with external world conditions over which no national state can exercise more than a limited control. To illustrate, a progressive increase in national exports is an indispensable item of the Government's detailed policy to meet the current crisis. If it fails in this endeavor the party will have failed in its commitment, yet there is no integral connection between the efficiency of an internal industrial system and the external fluctuations of world trade. In other words, the successful solution of Britain's two major problems—namely, national recovery and a restored financial stability in a highly competitive dollar market—although closely related to the immediate program of nationalization, is not necessarily contingent upon it. In view of present conditions, it would seem that the Labor Government is more likely to founder on the hazards of economic recovery than to fall as a result of the inherent weaknesses of state socialism and national controls.

As thus far projected, the aims of the new British socialized state are chiefly three in number: (1) The nationalization of all the basic industries of the country under governmental ownership and control; (2) national planning, through the cooperation of significant major agencies, both political and independent, with the intent of achieving full national employment, top efficiency in industry, and a maximum of social welfare; and (3) the development of an extended scheme of social security, the like of which has never before been attempted by a modern state. As a corollary to these undertakings, the present government has instituted far-reaching reforms in civil service, to insure that the enlarged body of public servants so closely associated with industrial production and private enterprises are technically equipped with proper qualifications for leadership in the centralized administration. As essential characteristic features, these main objectives have, for the most part, already been realized. Six basic industries are now under the management of the state: coal, electricity, railways, airlines, canals and long-distance trucking, and gas works. Likewise, the full nationalization of other institutions, long dominated by national control, has now been completed, particularly the British Broadcasting Company, the world-wide Cable and Communications Company, telephones, and the Bank of England. The

last remaining basic industry under private ownership and operation is steel, and the fate of that vital industry is now pending parliamentary action. According to the announced Labor Party's 1950-election platform, cement, insurance, water supply, and "all suitable minerals" are earmarked for future nationalization, while chemicals and shipbuilding are forewarned to set their own houses in order, or suffer like absorption. If the party has another uninterrupted five-year tenure, still other businesses will undoubtedly be taken over in due time.

II

Historically, the advent of state socialism in Great Britain is neither novel in character nor sudden in its emergence. For a number of decades the steady if unspectacular evolution of the general pattern of state controls over banking, public utilities, and essential industries has been linked inseparably with advancing liberalism in England. Moreover, the postal system, the British Broadcasting Company, and the Bank of England (founded in 1694), to all intents and purposes were nationalized by slow, easy stages years ago. These advances and other similar extensions of state functions were accelerated by the numerous national restrictions imposed during 1939-46 as expedient wartime measures. Planned economy as a necessity of reconstruction was not only accepted but actually activated by the Union Coalition Government during the war and supported by all parties alike. Mr. Churchill, as leader of the Opposition and virtually "second prime minister" in the British government, is right in insisting that much of the credit for recent social legislation should be given to the Conservative Party, who initiated the fundamental program long before Labor gained power. Consequently, both the two major parties today are in general agreement on the broad, comprehensive social-economic program for the future, just as they are in essential concord on the problems of foreign policy and domestic administration. This unanimity of agreement in principle has been repeatedly stated by the Conservatives during the past months. State socialism, *per se*, has thus already passed far beyond the experimental stages. In practical extension, the welfare state is here

to stay, whether we will or not. Already many of the increased social services have become indispensable items of governmental expenditure. In most countries the government has made rapid strides since the war in the projection of state planning and social benefits. Whereas England has taken the lead in exploring new frontiers, she is by no means alone in her endeavors. As in so many fields of national administration there can be no abrupt reversal of policy. It would be a mistake to turn the clock back too suddenly, even though the future may conceivably repudiate many of the currently accepted principles of state action. Nor, for that matter, is there any intention of so doing. Last year the Conservative Party Convention unequivocally advised the public that it would not denationalize those industries already taken over by the government. The Opposition, however, does seriously oppose a further extension of nationalization and will continue to fight bitterly for free steel, shipbuilding, and other similar privately-owned industries. But be this as it may, the dual objective of British socialism, that is, long-range state planning and the social welfare program, will not be abandoned willfully, regardless of political changes. Far too many millions of Britons have already accepted the doctrine of the welfare state for any reversal of policy. Political parties, national factions, and independent group organizations may, and *do*, differ radically on the ways and means of attainment; but as yet there has been no concerted action against the social ideal, which is, by necessity, the *raison d'être* of the new social dynamic.

There is a natural tendency to emphasize those particular aspects of a foreign movement that are antipathetic to our American way of life, an approach which has led to the great publicity given in the United States to the public-ownership feature of British socialism. As a result, the unfavorable publicity has, to a degree, blinded the casual observer to the trends of the times. Whether industry and big business remain in private or public hands is, of course, important; but of far greater significance is the question of effecting a closer union between economic and political democracy that will in the long run bring a greater equality of economic opportunity to all. Certainly it has become one of the most vital concepts of the Labor Party and of the Fabian socialism from which it sprang,

and, in the larger sense, the emphasis given to statewide planning in all fields of national endeavor is but an indication of its general acceptance. The Lord President of the Council, Mr. Herbert Morrison, fairly stated the British objective some time ago when he categorically announced to the world: "Britain is the first great nation to attempt to combine large-scale economic and social planning with a full measure of individual rights and liberties." Mr. Churchill voiced the same idea recently in his address from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology campus to the people of the United States when he reviewed the progress of English liberalism during the past three decades. But careful planning in any field involves detailed analysis of the existing situation, an accurate examination of over-all trends, and a consistent and forceful direction of determined objectives. When carried to its ultimate conclusion—and it must be so extended if positive results are expected—such intervention by the state means paternalism in government. The historian cannot help recalling the sumptuary legislation of the sixteenth century, with the impending dangers of the all-powerful Tudor monarchy. But conditions have changed fundamentally with the coming of popular representative responsible government, so that today absolutism in government is no longer beyond the public will. Still, the fact remains that under such a planned procedure, compulsion easily follows persuasion; and, even within the framework of democracy, a great deal of public education is necessary to train fifty million people to offer very many individual sacrifices for the benefit of a common good.

Since 1945, following a drastic war emergency, the Government has gone far beyond the analytical stages in peacetime planning. Without seriously impinging on the privacy or consciousness of the ordinary individual, the long arm of the state has reached out to every group in society, either to direct or influence a wide section of English life. In production, consumption, labor and the distribution of labor, education, agriculture, trade, and employment-planning the state has found it necessary to intervene. Obviously, a part of this extended interference was necessitated by the urgent need for a systematic budgeting of all national resources, but much of it came as a result of popular demand that no government, social, liberal, or otherwise, could afford to ignore. Even in the

United States recent trends in the same direction have convinced many that the imminent problems of a complex world require a new approach within the changing pattern of a troubled society. It is not without significance that state socialism, in one form or another, is being adopted all over the world. Simultaneously, organized private capitalism, as we know it, and the democratic principle are everywhere under attack. The crux of the problem lies not so much in the dangers of totalitarian-like developments in the democratic state as in the necessity of finding a compromise solution between economic achievement and the broader social responsibility which almost all groups of society have been forced to assume. Social organization, planning, and economic controls are not so much a matter of principle as of degree. Any conscientious attempt to explore the possibilities of a new potential should be welcomed.

III

The gulf between national prosperity and the individual standard of living among the masses of the English working people has always been a deterrent to social progress. Since the coming of the agrarian and industrial revolutions, the British statesmen have been confronted with the dilemma of retaining a class domination in the midst of a rising national consciousness of the needs of labor and the insecurity of nonpropertied groups. In one sense, the underlying theme of the whole reform movement of the nineteenth century was a resultant of the national urge toward a greater social security for all. The present attempt of the government to build a permanent structure of social security for the multifarious elements in society is but the culmination of a strong historic antecedent which found a fruitful expression in advanced social legislation some half a century before the rest of the Western World took up the challenge.

While it is easy to overemphasize purely historical forces, it is nevertheless true that a prolonged background of self-discipline combined with creative impulses sometimes produces a purposeful, determined achievement in a nation. Indeed, the extreme advance in Britain during the last few years in health, public education,

social insurance, old age pensions, compensation payments, family allowances, state subsidies, national housing, and extension services in agriculture are revolutionary in the projected field of national security. All the main features of the much publicized *Beveridge Report*, published and endorsed by the coalition war government in 1943, have been enacted into law, while in some spheres of activity legislation has exceeded the original goals. The series of statutes establishing the broad system of social benefits, designed to provide individual security "from the cradle to the grave," is a long one, but withal the list admits of profitable study. The fundamentals of the new program are contained in the Education Act of 1944, the National Insurance Act of 1946, the National Health Service Act of 1946, the Town and Country Planning Bill of 1947, and the Agriculture Act of 1947, though many of the details of organization are still in the primary stages. Unquestionably the greatest immediate benefit of the project is the help given to underprivileged classes. The results are clearly discernible in the improved health of the children, which is being realized through scientific nutritional programs, free milk and hot lunches in the schools, special food for infants, and provisional child care. Moreover, a higher standard of living for the adult citizens of the nation will be effected notably by the free medical, dental, specialist, and increased hospital services now available to all classes.

Significant as it is, however, such a comprehensive undertaking raises grave questions of a more practical nature. It is at once apparent that the difficulties of organizing and administering so vast a machinery of control are stupendous. Can an effective system of civil service be worked out to administer efficiently an organization so intricate and widespread? Or, given that instrumentality, will the people be willing to shoulder the increased tax burden necessary to the success of the program? Public opinion is divided on these points. The test of time alone can determine the answer.

The famous Beveridge plan to harmonize the existing British social services and extend them in all directions, in such a way as to abolish glaring inequalities and unnecessary want in the state, had to be paid for in part by private business and compulsory contributions by individual donors. The average worker is a recipient of the derived social benefits only to the degree in which he partic-

ipates in the program and pays in his contributions to the state. The fact that the broad outlines of the plan received the support of all political parties does not change the irrefutable logic that the system was bound to impose a heavy financial burden upon all classes of society. Even with the approval of the nation and the full cooperation of private agencies, the additional expense entailed a far greater drain on the national exchequer than had been visualized. New social or economic programs, by virtue of their unforeseen implications, invariably cost more than anticipated. Accordingly, Mr. Attlee warned the English public that every family must expect to contribute, either directly or indirectly in the form of taxation, in proportion to the new benefits to be derived. There can be no real simplification, said he. "You will have to contribute more than you have been doing up to now. Therefore, you must consider not only what you now have to pay but what you get and what you save." Nevertheless, the Government was also well aware that the financing of the additional state services would require a general speeding up of national production. "Only higher output can give us more of all the things we need," the Prime Minister added. "This will decide the real value of the money payments. All our social services have to be paid for in one way or another from what is produced by the people of this country. We cannot create a scheme which gives the nation more than they put into it, and it is always the general level of production that settles our standard of material well-being."

Still, increased production, encouraging as it has been in all fields except coal, has not minimized the necessity of continued austerity and rising taxes. The balanced budget, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Cripps, has insisted upon, has been secured only by a rigorous maintenance of higher taxation and the application of arbitrary financial controls that have proved unduly irksome to the individual. The Conservative victory in the recent London County election was particularly significant because it came just after the presentation of the national budget. Though there has been some relief in the self-imposed austerity policy the end is not yet, nor can it come until most of the final industrial aims are realized. Whereas the consolidated gains are more than promising, the objectives set are unusually high, as

shown by the *Economic Survey for 1949*. Some of them, as in the case of coal, are extremely difficult to attain, even under more favorable prewar conditions. The Government expects to complete its four-year plan by 1952, but meanwhile another unpopular budget must be presented to the nation, and that just preceding the general national election of 1950.

IV

An objective evaluation of the achievements of the Labor Government is not easy. The party promised more benefits for the people, more houses, more vacations, and more coal. Innumerable public services have been extended, but building has lagged and the promised coal production, to some extent, has broken down. The government pledged itself to accept full responsibility "for economic planning for the nation as a whole." This it has fulfilled. That "controls over capital investment, distribution of industry, industrial building, and foreign exchange will be required as permanent instruments" was admitted. To date, exports have been raised and considerable savings effected by import cuts. Agriculture has greatly expanded and several industries are now well beyond the 1938 level. The economic framework has been strengthened through central planning, yet in many walks of life personal incentives are being undermined. However, it must be remembered that the weariness of the British people is in large part due to ten years of continued deprivation and that national grumblings are closely associated with the long strain of war sacrifices.

The attack on free enterprise, on which the attention of so many critics is focused, is pronounced, but there is in no sense that wholesale destruction of private competition and individual initiative that reactionaries imply. Nationalization was not adopted indiscriminately as a utopian policy to eradicate all economic ills. Certain specified industries were earmarked for public control because it was believed that state ownership would insure a more efficient operation for the entire country. It would appear from tangible results that in certain fields, notably transportation and communication, that belief has been justified. The Government has announced that controls will be removed just as soon as the public

interest warrants their removal. The Labor Party insists, however, that new public enterprises should be established to compete with monopolistic big business, though where monopolies "are so big and powerful that competition would be valueless," they will have to go. Within the framework of reconstruction, free initiative and individual enterprise must be retained. When the leveling process comes—as come it will—a large percentage of Britain's economy will remain under private ownership. As Mr. Morrison has expressed it, the Government is "not out to abolish the profit motive," but resolved "to make it work for the people and not for the few."

The weaknesses in government administration have become the clearest target for objective criticism of the new order. While a large portion of the English population has accepted the main principles of a modified state socialism, they thoroughly dislike the incalculable slowness and waste manifest in public management. In practical operation, advancing social services, desirable within themselves, are often bogged down in the quagmire of bureaucracy. State corporations, governmental commissions, central tribunals, regional authorities, local boards, and interminable planning bureaus have multiplied overnight. Under the new Ministry of Town and Country Planning, established in February, 1943, there are no fewer than 1449 Local Authorities. When the Coal Industry Nationalization Act went into effect on January 1, 1946, the Minister of Fuel and Power assumed responsibility for over 1000 collieries, along with their numerous ancillary interests, a million acres of land, and some 800,000 employees. Responsible to the ministry, the National Coal Board of nine members operates the largest industry in the country, with an annual turnover of more than £400,000,000. As a public corporation, it controls eight divisions of the coal industry, which are further subdivided into forty-nine managerial areas and innumerable local directorates. Such a gigantic and complex organization, whether publicly or privately controlled, is open to constant attack.

Obviously a governing bureaucracy in any state is subject to many defects. Some of them are inherent in the principle of collective responsibility. Executive direction, concentrated in the hands of a single individual or a small group, is quicker and perforce con-

ductive to a greater efficiency; on the other hand, it is also inclined to be ruthless and exploitative. Representative democracies have learned that lesson from the totalitarian state. Likewise, it is equally true that the growing bureaucratic governments of the world have not yet perfected a unified system of administration. Most of them are still suffering from the awkwardness and inexperience of immaturity. How to readjust properly the governmental machinery so as to administer adequately the hundreds of new agencies that have become necessary in the state is one of the unsolved problems of our age. In Britain as in the United States, bureaucracy has grown top-heavy and over-organized. Directors are new at the job, without a trained body of civil servants to teach them the lessons of the past, because there is no past in their special departments. Blunders will be made, if for no other reason than the use of untried expedients. As in all government, injustices will emerge and confusion continue until the testing period is passed. If governmental business is guilty of procrastination, needless institutionalism, and unnecessary personnel, so is private business. That they are ineffective and susceptible to corruption is no proof that they cannot be made honest and efficient. To surrender a principle without a struggle is proof inherent that democracy has repudiated its own ideal of the validity of popular representation.

To the average analyst the development of British socialism appears to be either a utopian experiment or an attack upon the entire system of free enterprise. It has been variously praised or condemned according to the preconceived beliefs of the examiners. In reality it is neither, as an objective appraisal will suggest. It is an attempted compromise, characteristically English, a national cooperative effort to combine prosperity with social justice, within the traditions of evolutionary democracy as opposed to the more alien revolutionary isms of the past.

THE STRANGLEHOLD ON EDUCATION— A REPLY

By DAVID DONALD MALCOLM

Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee)

Harold L. Clapp's article in the current Summer issue of the *Bulletin* is another instance of the unfortunate tendency among critics of Education (with the capital *E*—the professional aspects of teacher education) to "throw the baby out with the bath." An honest study of each other's problems and a mutual exchange of healthy criticism can serve well both the sincere teachers in the departments of Education and their equally sincere colleagues in the academic fields. But an article such as Professor Clapp's, which shows no respect for the other fellow's problems and motives, is unlikely to elicit respect in return and cannot, therefore, be expected to promote any amelioration of the conditions which Professor Clapp deplores. Nor should such a one-sided discussion be permitted to go unanswered.

I deplore as much as anyone some aspects of (or related to) teacher education programs. I include among these certain of the weaknesses which Professor Clapp has singled out: rigid adherence to certification requirements measured in terms of credits earned instead of some more meaningful if less tangible evidence of proficiency acquired; pompously repetitious textbooks which waste the student's time and insult his intelligence; substitution of professional jargon for clear thinking; and inadequately directed and supervised courses in "Directed Observation and Supervised Practice Teaching."

But it is my contention that it is the professional educator—Professor Clapp's "Educationist" if you please—who, despite his failings, is doing the most toward developing that sort of educational system so essential if a democratic nation is to survive. In order to show that he both needs and deserves the close cooperation

of thoughtful colleagues instead of their carping criticisms, let me sketch hastily the background of the current critical moment in the history of education and the crucial rôle that the professional educator is playing.

II

One hundred years ago, Horace Mann and his contemporaries strove mightily for an expansion of educational opportunities in this country. Theirs was a tremendous accomplishment, made even more so by the lofty idealism which inspired it. It was their belief that if society could provide enough education for its members, society could eliminate the many ills which plagued it. Today we have succeeded in expanding our educational facilities far beyond their bravest hopes—so far that even a slight change in the birth rate is soon reflected in elementary school enrollments, so far that nearly three out of every four young persons of secondary-school age are in school today, so far that a college degree today is more common than a high-school diploma was twenty-five years ago.

But with the attainment of these goals has come disillusionment. Despite the nearness of our approach to universal education, our society still struggles with the same old ills. We still have poverty and slums, stubborn industrial strife, unsavory political machinations, and blinding, incapacitating prejudice and intolerance. Our present century has seen two world wars and no indication of increased promise for future peace. The faith in education that inspired educational leaders in Horace Mann's day seems pitifully naïve today. The lesson of one hundred years of educational expansion is clear. Increased educational opportunity has not been enough.

Now that this period of faith in mere expansion is obviously ended, education in America is seeking new direction. Out of the wreckage of the old idealism, three very different trends are emerging. Two of these, disheartened by failure, would turn back the clock. The danger in both is that their adherents, consciously or unconsciously, virtually admit to the conviction that democracy is an unworkable ideal. The third, alone, finds

in past shortcomings not total defeat but a lesson for the future. It is in our schools and departments of Education that we find the outstanding champions of this third trend, the one trend demonstrating continued faith in the ideals of the democratic way of life.

Let me identify these three trends briefly. The first, epitomized by the spokesmen for the Great Books sort of education, frankly maintains that only a small proportion of our population can benefit by what they choose to term *liberal education*. So as President Hutchins calls for the elimination of the "deadwood" from our college student bodies, a Harvard Committee calls on us "to consider first what would be best for those most able to profit,"¹ numerous voices are raised in praise of the "hard" subjects, and the cry for higher academic "standards" is heard throughout the land. We have made a mistake, they insist, by modifying our standards in order to adapt education to the masses, and we must now retrace our steps. Education for the few is the watch-word, and the goals are the transmission of the cultural heritage of our western civilization and the search for eternal verities in the great writings of the past. Laudable though their goals may be, their concentration on the few to the exclusion of the many and on the past to the exclusion of the contemporary constitutes a clearcut betrayal of the educational needs of a democratic way of life.

The second trend at first sight is less obviously at variance with our democratic traditions. This trend is characterized by the demand for more emphasis on *moral education*. Occasionally it goes under the heading of "civic education." More often it insists openly on religious instruction in the schools. So we hear from pulpits of many denominations our schools and colleges denounced as "Godless"; so we see the insistent demand for "released time," a Supreme Court decision to the contrary notwithstanding; so we note a startling expansion of parochial education, not by just one but by several denominations. To criticize here is to tread on dangerous ground. But, ignoring for the moment the arguments pro and con, it still is clear that re-wedding school and church is, historically speaking, turning back the clock. And there is real reason to doubt, as I shall attempt to show

¹ Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1946), p. 108.

later, that the authoritative approach to which religious instruction is by nature prone is adequate for developing an adult citizenry capable of making a democratic nation function properly. Our quarrel here lies not with the goals but with the methods suggested for attaining them.

The third trend, recognizing the ineffectiveness of increased amounts of education *of the same old sort*, calls for a completely *new type of education*. From this point of view, the modern frontiers in education lie in the improvement of educational *methods*. The other two trends, accepting old methods and reverting to earlier patterns (themselves once before abandoned as inadequate), place their emphasis on educational contents—in the one case our cultural heritage, in the other moral teachings. Improved methods, indeed the whole philosophy of modern education, the adherents of the new education insist, must be firmly rooted in psychology and based on the best available understanding of the principles governing human behavior and development.

From this emphasis on methods rather than contents has come the realization that *how* one teaches is more important than *what* one teaches. This is the conclusion that most markedly differentiates the third trend from either of the other two; it is also the idea that has proved most exasperating and incomprehensible to the professional educator's subject-matter-minded colleagues in the academic fields. Yet honest scrutiny makes this conclusion inescapable.

Hopkins cites so apt an illustration on this point that I quote it here:

A college professor was very elated when his young son showed proficiency in learning a fixed list of spelling words in his second year of school. Some of his friends asked about the methods by which the words were taught. The professor replied that he was little concerned with the method. He wanted results in spelling and the school seemed to be obtaining them very satisfactorily, as indicated by his son's perfect reports. Two years later this same professor was vigorous in his criticism of the school for failing to obtain results. His son now disliked spelling and failed approximately half of the time. In addition, he was falling down in meeting the fixed knowledge ends in other subjects, such as reading, geography, and arithmetic. It was some time before this

fundamentalist professor realized that *the way in which his child learned to spell determined whether in the long run he would continue to spell or that the way in which he learned to read determined his interest and facility in reading in later years.* (Italics mine.)¹

We have all heard of the high-school principal who, in his fiftieth year, came to reread *Silas Marner* and was surprised to discover that it was a very good novel after all. Our amusement here should be tempered by more sober considerations. The Essentialists among our curriculum makers have been so busy incorporating "essential" skills and subject matter into course contents with so little concern about the consequences of *how* they were taught and so little consideration for the nature of the learning process that they have failed entirely to leave their students with the one real essential of sound education—the desire to go on learning (which is slightly different, by the way, from that "love of knowledge" which the Harvard Report deems to be the "indispensable thing"). George Bernard Shaw is entirely justified in expressing the hope that his plays will never become texts in the schools.

III

John Dewey has pointed out that one of the most prevalent fallacies in the thinking of teachers is the idea that the individual learns only the thing he is studying at the time. Learning, it should be remembered, takes place only to the extent that behavior is modified thereby. Little facts like, say, the plot and characters in *Macbeth* can modify behavior but little, and then infrequently and only within relatively narrowly restricted situations; learned attitudes, however, like a distaste for Shakespeare (or for "good" literature as a whole) may result in major modifications which can impoverish an entire lifetime. Let us be very slow to agree with Professor Clapp when he remarks "there is much too little time to study the *subject* one is to teach when so much time is taken up by courses in *how* to teach. . ." (italics his) if we really are concerned

¹ L. Thomas Hopkins, *Interaction* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1941), p. 6.

for the lives of the children who will be the students of these teachers.

I sometimes ask students in my classes if it is possible to teach a child that $5 + 4 = 10$. The question puzzles them. Some say that it is, some say that it is not. The truth is, of course, that both answers are correct. It is perfectly possible to teach a child that $5 + 4 = 10$ if you get him when he is first introduced to the subject and if you follow the authoritarian procedures commonly used in today's classrooms. (And if you do not think that authoritarian methods are common, kindly reexamine the student-teacher relationship as it exists in most schools at all levels today!) On the other hand, if your teaching method consists of helping the learner to create situations out of which he may discover existing relationships through personal experiences, then you cannot possibly obtain this particular result. The difference is in method, in *how* the teaching is done.

Both of these are perfectly legitimate and effective methods of teaching. The former has the marked advantage of being easier and cheaper to practice (and adequate teachers can be trained to use it in a much shorter period of time). Indeed, I am sure that I would prefer it if my name were Adolf Schickelgruber, let us say, and I wanted an entire generation of young persons to learn that democratic nations were pitifully weak and decadent, that darker skin pigmentation meant membership in an inferior race, or that all persons of Semitic ancestry were secretly sworn enemies of the welfare of the state. But despite its effectiveness, its convenience, and its economy, I am not convinced of its appropriateness in a democratic nation.

Teachers are constantly under pressure to use this method to teach presumably desirable (from the democratic point of view) attitudes in matters such as tolerance, civic responsibility, patriotism, and a host of others. The trouble is that learning resulting from this sort of teaching is the automatic, inflexible, mechanical type of learning that we call a "signal reaction." A chimpanzee, you know, that has been taught to drive an automobile can be taught to stop and go in response to red and green traffic signals. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Chimp will stop immediately for a red signal even if he is at the moment

in the middle of an intersection and he will start ahead on green even if a heavy truck is bearing down on him from the left. Such behavior scarcely makes for survival. Herein lies the great fallacy in the misguided if sometimes well-intentioned educational procedures advocated by patriotic organizations, the Hearst-type press, and many other groups powerful in American life. Monkey-like signal reactions just do not have the survival qualities necessary for adult citizens whose responsibility it is to make democracy work in our complex modern world.

New teachers tend to teach as they have been taught. There is no quick and easy way to bring about a change to the methods of the newer education. Twelve to sixteen years' experience with other types leaves a great deal which must be undone. Thorough understanding of the nature of psychological growth and development, extensive observation and study of new procedures, sufficient opportunity to try out and evaluate after careful comparison and discussion old and new methods alike, and time for every student to develop a mature personal philosophy of education which will give direction to his efforts—these are the essentials of good teacher education. To educate a student in this, the most important part of his preparation for teaching, is a time-consuming process.

IV

Yes, there is a "stranglehold on education," as Professor Clapp says, but it is not what he describes. The stranglehold is the persistence of traditional authoritarian methods in our classrooms despite the fact that over and over again they have proved themselves to be inadequate for the purposes of a democratic society. The stranglehold is perpetuated by inadequately educated teachers who fail to grasp the fact that how they teach is more important than what they teach in determining truly lasting effects. And, far from perpetuating this stranglehold for the sake of vested interests, the professional educators are the one group making the strongest concerted effort to break it down.

It is true that courses in professional education too often still demonstrate the very practices that in theory they strive to correct. They still demonstrate most of the faults common to college

teaching in general and sometimes others peculiar to themselves as well. It is true, too, that for the most part teachers of professional education have been very "touchy" about accepting criticism from colleagues in the academic fields. But criticism of the sort that concludes with Professor Clapp that "at best, there is material here for one good book and one course" does little to clarify the situation. What is sorely needed is criticism that is made by open-minded educators who recognize and respect the rôle that professional education is playing, and who are willing to accept and learn from legitimate criticisms made in return.

Progress toward newer methods in education is just beginning. Psychology, on which the newer methods must be based, is still an infant science. The territory is not yet charted; every teacher must be a pioneer. Every teacher must be a teacher first and a subject-matter specialist only incidentally if at all. Small wonder a lion's share of his four college years must be devoted to the study of Education, of how to teach. Five or more years is better, of course, but until that becomes possible waste no pity on the child whose teacher received his degree from a good teachers college or who spent a major proportion of his college career in learning how to teach. For democracy's hopes lie in its educational system, and the hopes of the educational system rest on those teachers who are equipped to tackle education's number one problem—how to teach.

THE BIBLE IN THE COLLEGES

By WALTER HOUSTON CLARK

Middlebury College

"A rabbi in Mazarine baptized Jesus." This interesting bit of information is a fair gauge of how much some of our college students know about the Bible. One function of the liberal arts college, we are told, is to acquaint the student with the outstanding documents and features of our cultural heritage. If this is so, it is rather strange that the colleges, from admission offices to faculties and administrations, have paid so little attention to the Bible, our most important religious, literary, and sociological document.

With thoughts such as these in mind, the writer attempted to gain some idea of how much college students knew about the Bible by devising a simple test of twenty questions of fact on the Bible and giving it to a random selection of 137 men and women in various years at several well-known New England colleges of liberal arts. It was not the idea that the ability to answer the questions would guarantee the deeper kind of appreciation of Biblical literature and thought, but simply that it would indicate knowledge of content. The questions, ten on the Old Testament and ten on the New Testament, follow:

1. Name a person who lived in the Garden of Eden.
2. Who led the Children of Israel out of Egypt?
3. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" is quoted from what?
4. Whose strength lay in his unshorn hair?
5. Name the great king of Israel who committed adultery with the wife of Uriah the Hittite.
6. What prophet won a public contest against the priests of Baal in bringing fire from Heaven?
7. What person showed great patience though covered with boils?
8. "The Lord is my Shepherd" is quoted from what book in the Bible?

9. In what book of the Bible do we find the story of Nebuchadnezzar's fiery furnace and the three steadfast young men?
10. Except for Daniel and Jonah, mention a prophet whose name also designates a book of the Bible.
11. Which of the following was the mother of Jesus? Bathsheba, Anna, Mary the sister of Martha, Mary Magdalene, the wife of Joseph, Ruth.
12. In what town was Jesus born?
13. Who baptized Jesus?
14. Name one of Jesus' earliest disciples.
15. In what famous parable does a young man eat the food of swine?
16. What event was the tragic climax in the life of Jesus?
17. Who is often called the "Apostle to the Gentiles?"
18. Who wrote many of the Epistles?
19. Name one of the four Gospels.
20. In what book appear the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse?

The test would hardly be termed a searching one, yet the average grade obtained by the collegians was barely over fifty per cent! The typical college student, in other words, could answer about half of the questions correctly. It will be instructive to examine some of the items and to note in more concrete terms to what depths collegiate ignorance of the Bible can descend.

II

It might be expected that no one educated enough to get to college could ever miss—or at least hardly ever—on being asked to name an inhabitant of the Garden of Eden. This expectation, at least, was pretty well borne out, for the great majority of our group were able to comply—by far the best showing on any question. Yet it is worthy of note that three of our 137 students were not even able to do this. Runner-up to this question was number 16, where nearly nine out of every ten answers were correct. This question, like all the others, was scored generously. Several got credit for citing the betrayal by Judas, the denial by Peter, or other tragic incidents that showed accurate knowledge of some tragic event associated with the Crucifixion. However, credit was not extended to the young man who identified the tragedy as Jesus'

"burning in effigy at the cross," and certainly not to another youth who said it was His christening!

While nearly four-fifths knew that Moses led the Children of Israel out of Egypt, nevertheless David, Jonah, Abraham, and Jesus were among those suggested for the honor. Despite the fact that most of the students sing "O Little Town of Bethlehem" several times every Christmas season, there were more than one in every five who said that Jesus was born in places such as Jerusalem, Nazareth, and "Israel."

"The Lord is my Shepherd" was correctly spotted by only three-fourths, while a third were unable to place "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." More surprising is the fact that only two-thirds were able to name one of the Gospels! One of the great stories of the ages, many times retold, is the story of the betrayal of Samson to the Philistines by Delilah, yet the man whose strength lay in his unshorn hair was variously designated as David, Goliath, Daniel, Isaiah, Simon, Paul, Herod, Jesus, Hercules, and Pericles! About two in every five got the answer wrong. Nearly the same proportion did not know that it was John who baptized Jesus, some of them Baptists; but only a little over half correctly identified the wife of Joseph as the mother of Jesus! A strong minority labored under the impression that it was Mary Magdalene, despite the fact that the Bible describes her as a woman possessed by devils. The rest thought it was the sister of Martha.

"Name one of the earliest disciples of Jesus" was rather a vague item. Generous scoring yielded fifty-five per cent correct replies on this, but only thirty-eight per cent, or a clear minority, indicated St. Paul as the writer of "many of the Epistles." "The patience of Job" must be only another expression to the typical college student, for only one in three knew who it was who showed great patience though covered with boils. Less than one in three could mention the name of a prophet whose name also designates a book of the Bible. In this connection the following were promoted, or demoted, to the rank of prophet: Noah, Abraham, Joshua, Matthew, Mark, Luke, Paul, Timothy, "Leviticus," and Jehovah. Fewer than three in every ten could identify St. Paul as the Apostle to the Gentiles, most of the students apparently considering the question

open, though there was one student who ventured the theory that it was the "Pope in Rome."

It is rather melancholy to reflect that only twenty-eight per cent were familiar enough with the troubles of that well beloved son in the "far country" to identify the beautifully told and moving parable that describes them. It is perhaps easier to forgive the slightly larger group who were not well enough acquainted with another famous story to know that David was the great king whose shame was his great love for Bathsheba.

Hardly more than a fifth knew the name of the book in the New Testament in which appear the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. It is interesting to speculate how much better the record would have been if the words "Notre Dame" had substituted for "the Apocalypse." But at least Notre Dame was not suggested in the answers as things were, though Ibáñez and, for some reason, Sabatini were.

Questions 6 and 9 were correctly answered only by about one in ten of the students. Apparently Elijah's victory by the brook Kishon has lost considerable lustre and appeal in our scientific age, though this dramatic narrative was a favorite among youth in the days of our forebears. On the other hand the poor showing on 9 might be excused, for though Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego featured in a popular song not so very long ago, how is one to connect their near martyrdom with the Book of Daniel if one has not read it recently?

III

It is perhaps worth our while to reflect briefly on the meaning of these results. Of course a statistician would point out that our sample is small, and our selection of colleges may not be representative. Doubtless there are many colleges with strong religious traditions where the students would not only bring to college more Biblical information but would also be required to study the Bible in college. And it certainly would be possible to select a group in any college that would do much better. For example, classes of students studying religion and the Bible in various institutions have made much more respectable scores on this test. None of the

colleges which produced the results we have been discussing required any knowledge of the Bible for entrance or for graduation; nevertheless these institutions are fairly typical of the better regarded and more selective colleges of the country. These results were cited to faculty members in several other institutions, who agreed that results would be much the same in their own colleges. It would not seem rash to venture the statement that there is considerable ignorance of what in former days used to be quite commonplace information about the Bible among college students. And if this is so, certainly we can be sure that the modern college student must be severely handicapped in understanding certain aspects of his culture. Let me be more specific.

First of all, there are many who miss the flavor and allusions of some of our greatest writers. It is no wonder that the accents of *Paradise Lost* are losing more and more appeal as the years go on. Without a grounding in the Bible a student has little chance of understanding even the main theme, let alone the Biblical allusions profusely scattered in every part of that great work. Shakespeare seems not to have been a very religious man, yet many of his lines are unintelligible without the Biblical key, as when Shylock justifies himself by speaking of the doubtfully honorable transactions between Jacob and Laban. Again, Burns is usually a favorite with those whose ears are just beginning to open to good poetry, but how many of our 137 guinea pigs would know what Burns is talking about when he speaks of

. . . how the royal Bard did groaning lie
Beneath the stroke of Heaven's avenging ire;
Or Job's pathetic plaint, and wailing cry;
Or rapt Isaiah's wild, seraphic fire

How He, who bore in Heaven the second name,
Had not on earth whereon to lay His head:
How His first followers and servants sped;
And precepts sage they wrote to many a land;
How he, who lone in Patmos banishèd,
Saw in the sun a mighty angel stand,
And heard great Bab'lon's doom pronounced by Heaven's command.

Similarly there will be great gaps in the same students' apprecia-

tion of art and music, where Biblical concepts and themes have supplied the ideational substance as well as oftentimes the inspiration itself.

Other areas where the influence of the Bible is not recognized as it should be are those of politics and sociology. It might be argued that since teachers in these fields make very little of this influence, we should not concern ourselves as to whether students know their Bibles or not. But perhaps the teachers themselves are victims of the same tradition in which the current generation of students are reared, and this is no reason for our feeling satisfied about it. If certain religious ideas from the Bible have helped to make our political concepts and sociological conventions what they are, the thorough student of our culture wants to be aware of them.

For instance, the democratic emphasis on the rights of the individual can be traced back, in one of its roots, to the laws of Moses. They were reinforced by the Hebrew prophets and the teachings of Jesus. Or to give another example, our present sense of responsibility toward the unfortunate and the suffering owes most of its vitality to the Biblical and Christian tradition. Many a patient whose pain has been eased in a modern hospital has never thought of the connection between his relief and the tradition that made it possible. But a student of sociology should be aware of it; and this awareness will scarcely dawn on the mind ignorant of the Bible.

If we wish our college youth to understand such things, we must first see that they learn considerably more than they now know about the Bible.

IV

How do the colleges react to this evidence of Biblical ignorance? Do they feel that it represents the situation in their own institutions and if so do they think that anything can be done about it or should be done about it? With a view to obtaining answers to questions like these a letter was written to twenty-nine of the better known liberal arts colleges of the country, mostly in the privately supported, undenominational category. The evidence from our test was cited, and comments were asked about the situation on

each particular campus. Replies were received from twenty-three, in many cases directly from the president of the college, in other cases from someone delegated by him. The following observations and quotations are taken from these replies.

There seems to be general agreement that college students as a whole would be found to know little more about the Bible than did the unfortunates who were subjected to the test. "There is," says President Butterfield of Wesleyan University, "no doubt whatsoever as to the relative Biblical illiteracy of college students, particularly those going on to the nonsectarian colleges"; while President Sills of Bowdoin College writes, "I do not think that the ignorance of the Bible among students at schools and colleges needs any demonstration."

Three exceptions to this statement were the replies from Mount Holyoke College, Bryn Mawr College, and Brown University, which indicated that students at these institutions would be likely to find the questions "fairly elementary," as President Ham of Mount Holyoke put it. Presumably there should be added to this list the names of Bates College and Wellesley College, where courses on the Bible are required—at least if the test were given after, rather than before, the requirements were fulfilled. It is worthy of note that all of these five exceptions were either women's colleges or co-educational. It might be pointed out that in our population of 137 Biblical illiterates women were in the minority, so that it would seem entirely reasonable to surmise that men students are less well informed about the Bible than are women. In view of the greater interest in religion of the average woman, this would not seem a rash hypothesis, though the nature of the test is such as to suggest that women could score considerably higher on it than men and still not be in any serious danger of qualifying as Biblical experts.

Reasons for the decline of Biblical knowledge are variously given. President Nason of Swarthmore College thinks "it may be that one reason is the disappearance of Bible courses in colleges and universities, although I believe a much more important factor is the decline in attendance at Sunday School and in the reading of the Bible at home. Certainly students come to college today without the familiarity with the Bible which formerly was expected of most

college students." President Butterfield states, "In the colleges themselves the whole mood of sectarianism has gradually eliminated the Bible from its place in the curriculum. In some places it has been maintained 'as literature.' As you know, however, religion in a sectarian age is somewhat suspect, especially among the so-called 'intellectuals,' and this fact combined with a deep instinct for freedom of religious thought has done the damage."

The letter to the colleges asked about their programs for teaching the Bible, and specifically what the feeling was about compulsory courses in the Bible at their institutions. Wellesley and Bates were the only colleges in the group which at present have such a course. There were several others that have compulsory courses under other names in which the Bible is given some attention. At Dartmouth College this is the case with respect to the required course in English, while at Colgate, Wesleyan, Chicago, and Brown Universities there are compulsory programs of a general nature for all or at least large numbers of students, and these courses give some attention to the Bible. Haverford College and Oberlin College have courses in Biblical literature which satisfy a rather limited choice of electives, and so these courses enroll a fair proportion of the student body.

But most of these colleges have no such courses and seem emphatically not to want them. This feeling extends even to the religion departments as well, where one might expect to find some enthusiasm for a program which would bring them more students. A typical statement comes from Professor John W. Flight of the Department of Biblical Literature at Haverford. After stating that he believes the faculty as a whole would disapprove a course of compulsory Bible study he says, "I must say that I myself am not too enthusiastic about making Bible a required course for graduation, since I passed through a few years, during my early years here, when such a requirement was laid down, and I found the experience a trying one." Again President Bixler of Colby College, whose subject field is religion, has this to say: "I think there is only one real objection to required courses in Biblical literature and that is that they are required. We have seen a revolt against required courses of all kinds. I am inclined to think that to single the Bible out as a compulsory subject would not achieve the ends we wish,

and my experience with required Bible instruction bears out this opinion." Somewhat similar positions were taken in the replies from Harvard, Princeton, Smith, and Mount Holyoke, while other replies implied though they did not explicitly state the same point of view. Although several respondents stated that their faculties were not hostile to the Bible, one got the impression that a proposal of compulsory Biblical instruction on most campuses would be the signal of the beginning within most faculties of a first-class academic civil war.

However, most though not all of the replies agreed with President Sills' feeling that "anything that can be done to remove that (Biblical) illiteracy is all to the good." This was particularly true of the college presidents who took the trouble to reply in person, though their emphases and approaches differed. The most frequently repeated point made was that the Bible was best studied in a context that tended to bring out its relationship, philosophically and otherwise, to the culture of which it forms a part. President Jefferson of Clark University, a philosopher by training, concedes the importance of religious ideas but says, "I think that the philosophical ideas and institutions of religion in the Western world are quite as important as the basic literary document on which Western religions have been built." Dean F. C. Ward of the College at the University of Chicago writes, "In general, I should say that students in American colleges will take the Bible seriously if they are not exhorted to do so. When it appears as relevant material in their study of some problems or literary *genre* or intellectual discipline, the Bible is considered by them respectable. When it is presented as a special source of moral and historical illumination, they give it short shrift."

V

It would seem then, that if a movement may be detected in collegiate Bible teaching, it is not only away from compulsory courses in Bible but in some degree it is toward courses which under other names introduce Biblical material. In view of the temper of the modern undergraduate and modern faculty, this would seem the strategic approach for those interested in reviving

the echoes of the Bible's strong and lovely accents in the ears of the undergraduate and its timeless themes in dormitory talk.

But this is not to say that compulsion has not its place. Some of the colleges do successfully exercise a certain measure of compulsion with respect to the Bible. Also, though they were not the subject of our present concern, it should be said that many denominational colleges logically have continued for many years compulsory courses in the Bible which have been both creditable and effective. Such cases may perhaps help to justify the existence of denominational ties which make this emphasis logical and natural. But we would be losing much instruction were we to pass over without further comment the two members of our group of twenty-nine who still operate required courses in the Bible, namely Bates and Wellesley. Since President Mildred McAfee Horton of Wellesley wrote in considerable detail, it may be more profitable to concentrate on that very successful program. Mrs. Horton makes at least four points about the religion courses at Wellesley. First, standards for membership in the department are very high. This means that the courses are well taught and are recognized as worth while by the student body. "I have heard freshmen demur over having to take time for sophomore Bible," says Mrs. Horton; "I have not yet heard objections from upperclassmen to the fact of its requirement." Second, because of their competence, the teachers of Bible have status with members of other departments, and the program has strong faculty support. Third, "because of its required status the department is large enough to involve varieties of religious conviction and points of view so that the students do not feel that the work in Biblical History is 'indoctrination.'" Fourth, the course has the force of a successful tradition behind it.

While not every college has the advantage of this last feature, the other features may commend themselves as the ingredients of a successful program for any department, Biblical or otherwise. As a matter of fact, though naturally not many colleges advertise the fact, and none of the replies stated it in our present study, it is fair to say that colleges which fail with the Bible do so because the department teaching it is small, or incompetent, or lacking in status with the faculty or the student body. Many a college, both small and large, simply will not spend the money necessary for a

first-class department of religion. This policy is usually justified on the grounds that there is no student demand for courses in religion, which naturally will be the case while the offerings are meagre, dull, or lacking in academic prestige. It is noteworthy that colleges reporting considerable student election of courses in Bible and religion are those with competent instructors, the latter usually in sufficient quantity to offer some variety. Wesleyan, Mount Holyoke, Haverford, and Oberlin are further cases in point here, though perhaps the most instructive example is Princeton. From this latter institution Professor Paul Ramsey writes that a committee formed several years ago recommended a full professor of religion. This led to the present department of four men with 450 students enrolled in its courses in a single semester.

Such experiences as have been recounted suggest that any college that really feels the Bible and religion important enough may succeed in establishing a successful department, though it may also mean the spending of more money and the changing of emphases.

Of course there will be the objection that on many campuses the clientele is such that expansion of religious facilities is difficult. This objection may have some force with respect to state-supported institutions, as Professor S. Vernon McCasland reminds us from the University of Virginia. But the function of a college faculty is not always to follow what the student body and the alumni suggest. Naturally the average college president is in a difficult position even though he may deplore Biblical illiteracy. William Tyndale indignantly asserted that he would cause the boy who drove the plough to know more of the Bible than did the Bishop. But any college president devoted so singly to a cause as Tyndale, even though as great a one as his, would not hold office very long. Balance is one of the things that the college president needs. If he did not demonstrate this before his election, he probably would not have been selected, and if he served a special interest afterward, he would not last. The re-establishment of the Bible to its proper cultural proportions in the curriculum is a kind of special interest about which only an unusual president would feel able to do anything very radical even if he had the power. Rather it must be those among students, alumni, or faculty who have convictions to prod, wheedle, or cajole the authorities to take the steps that it

seems wise and desirable to take. Perhaps more than anybody, a friend of the college possessing that somewhat rare combination of a love for the Bible and his college together with a great deal of money may be willing to subsidize the kind of department of which we have been speaking.

Yet all of these speculations have left out of account the best ally for reviving the Bible, and that is the Bible itself. Any teacher with his faculties half alive to the rich opportunities offered him can capture the interest of all but the most perverse undergraduate even under the handicap of compulsion. For here in the pages of the Bible lie the great issues of life and death that are the concerns of all human beings. They only need to be presented correctly. Here are the emotions that have blown through us all. Here are the skill and flexibility of language to roll out the stories of battles and cruel deeds, as in the Song of Deborah; or delicately and sweetly to sing the love music of the Song of Solomon. If children can be held from their play—and they have been known to be—by the fascination of the story of Job and the problem of suffering, how much more, mature college students, if only the approach be moderately skilful. Thanks to the King James translators, the lilies of the field still keep the freshness enjoyed long ago by the crowds that walked the roads of Gallilee, while the story of the "certain man" who journeyed to Jericho is still clear to the ear of the unlettered person at the same time that its message is pondered by the mind of the scholar.

With half an opportunity students will recognize the value of the greatest work in our cultural tradition. But first of all it is the faculty, administrators, and trustees who must sense the importance of the Bible and feel its appeal. Perhaps our compulsory course, if we decide to have it, would bring best results if they rather than the undergraduates were required to attend it.

ACADEMICS ANONYMOUS

A Profile of a Little-Known Benevolent and Protective Organization, Done in the Most Widely Accepted Expository Style

By JOSEPH JONES

University of Texas

It is likely that most of our readers, even though they live near (or at least are officially connected with) a university campus, have never even so much as heard the name of an organization which quietly and steadily every day works among us at a task of human reclamation. This group, known as "Academics Anonymous," numbers among its members some of the most distinguished citizens of the community—men in positions of influence and trust who give freely of their time and effort in a cause which to many of them has become almost like a religion.

Academics Anonymous—or rather the germ of the organization—came into being one day nearly fifty years ago, as the result of a statistical study which profoundly shocked a small body of professional professionals. This study, which when undertaken seemed harmless enough for a Master's thesis, a dissertation, or even a high-school debate question, revealed unmistakable evidence of a drift towards academic habits on the part of college faculties—nothing spectacular, but serious enough, as subsequent studies and field work have shown. At first incredulous, the little band who were to become the nucleus of Academics Anonymous checked and rechecked the data by every known means. No error had been made, they at length reluctantly concluded; the result was always the same. Only a resolute course of action would save the situation, all agreed; yet in those early days the present well-knit organization was but faintly foreshadowed. Several critical years were to pass before Academics Anonymous was full-blown.

Despite well-organized campaigns, however, the tendency towards academicism (habitual academic behavior) has been slowly

but steadily on the increase until today we are faced with the startling fact that one out of every eight to ten faculty members is either already an habitual academic or else dangerously on the verge of becoming one. Amazing as it may seem, this is not too liberal an estimate. Academics Anonymous have always, in fact, interpreted their findings in the most conservative fashion. But it is probable that AA would be unknown even today if it were not apparent that help from outside will be needed if the work is to reach the peak of its potentialities. The organization already, in fact, has received substantial contributions from men in other callings; but there is always one string attached: none but members of Academics Anonymous may engage in what is known as "clinical inquisition."

The men who make up the membership of Academics Anonymous have a common bond in the sobering realization that at one time every man of them was an academic himself. To be sure, the extent to which the habit fixed itself upon him varies a great deal; but it can invariably be said that he has been deeply enough involved to experience a feeling of genuine compassion for the addict. Many an Acadan can say to himself, as he sees an unfortunate colleague struggling in the toils, "But for Academics Anonymous, I might have been that man!"

Acadan, we perhaps should add, is a generic term for any member of the band. The organization is stratified to some extent, with *Acadeans* as area-leaders who correlate the work of a specified number of *Acadons* in specific locations; but for purposes other than purely organizational, every member is simply an *Acadan*, with a common mission of uplift and a sense of togetherness with his spiritual brethren.

While membership, as the name implies, carries with it the cloak of anonymity, it is well known that Academics Anonymous includes very important figures on nearly every campus in the country: deans, vice-presidents, departmental chairmen, and not infrequently presidents themselves. Always, however, the same inflexible qualification for membership holds true: the full-fledged Acadan was at one time or another tainted with the curse of academic habits. The exclusiveness of the organization may be realized when one reflects that neither General Eisenhower nor Governor Stassen, presidents of great universities though they may be, can

be eligible for anything more than honorary or associate membership. Unless they were to fall victims to the habit (an unlikely contingency in men of such high moral character in positions of trust), they must remain in that capacity. This does not mean, of course, that they cannot be of considerable service if their inclinations and opportunities should lead them in this particular direction.

The fervor with which the Acadans undertake their work is a measure of how intensely they must feel. They conduct literally thousands of "clinical inquisitions," make hundreds of speeches, and travel incalculable distances on special missions or to routine conventions and other such conclaves. It is true that they do not write a great deal, which may in part account for the slight extent to which their activities have hitherto been publicized. Their speeches frequently permit some insight into their operations; but generally speaking, they would rather not court publicity. They prefer to do their work quietly and efficiently in their own surroundings, out of the glare of the spotlight, ever mindful that if even one wretch can be redeemed from his plight, their reward is already greater than public laudation could supply.

II

But how does Academics Anonymous do its work? What goes on behind the scenes? The following episode (AA Files, Case No. 002. J196-"X"), as reported in a speech by President Handswinger of Jubilee Institute at a service club luncheon, forms one of the most telling exhibitions that we could offer. President Handswinger, it must be remembered, was speaking not as a member of the Band—not as an Acadan—but only as an educator and citizen who is interested in seeing so charitable a work proceed.

"Professor X," the account reads, "was a particularly difficult case of habitual academicism. He had progressed so far, in fact, that the DT was a regular characteristic of his behavior. [Note: The "DT" refers to the psychotic state known medically as *denarium tremens*, or salary fixation.] He had lost self-control to such an extent that he shamelessly discussed his salary not only with his wife (who was driven nearly to distraction over the unfortunate condition), but even with his colleagues. His was an especially

trying predicament for all concerned, since normally he was a cheerful, rather likeable person, and the possibility that he might draw others into his orbit could not be overlooked. Quite obviously, he was a challenge to the Band.

"Academics Anonymous began to work on this case a few weeks before the beginning of the fall term just a year ago. During clinical inquisition (Form A), X acknowledged his condition quite candidly, and said that he would be more than grateful for any relief that anyone could provide. He was then placed under a strict regimen and assigned to the care of two of our most experienced Acadons, who on several occasions had conferences with the (resident) Acadean.

"Our treatment of X began with the routine procedure of plenary expostulation accompanied by intravenous monition. He was told that talking about his salary was after all quite a useless gesture, and that he was becoming an embarrassment not only at home but to the whole college as well. He admitted upon questioning that he got no pleasure from his indulgence; that he would rather not feel driven to it; and that in fact he had made efforts occasionally to avoid the practice, but to no avail. In a broken voice he finally confessed that *denarium tremens* had indeed actually set in, and he could not bear to think what might finally become of his poor wife and children unless something were done soon. Even in the face of such realization, however, he kept to his old paths.

"After reports that initial treatment had been less effective than hoped for, X was given stern warning that the administration was concerned about him, and that he must shortly mend his ways or else steps might be taken. This appeared to throw him into a fit of profound depression (not by any means unknown to such cases), and he shortly thereafter suffered one of his most serious lapses, wandering aimlessly from office to office among his colleagues and uttering tirades of shocking abuse mingled with weird mutterings about 'pork and beans and the price of having teeth straightened.'

"At this point the Acadean himself took over the case personally. X was placed on the discipline of total abstinence, but was not hospitalized. With great skill and no less patience, the Acadean led X slowly out of the shadows and made possible his ultimate restoration as a useful member of the college community. The most

remarkable and praiseworthy part of the entire proceeding is that it was found unnecessary to adjust the salary either up or down. There is a school of thought outside AA which believes in graduated salary adjustment as a radical cure for *denarium tremens*; however, we need much more evidence before we can feel safe in advocating or adopting such a strenuous measure.¹

"Proof of the efficacy of this particular cure has been observed and reported on several subsequent occasions. Invariably, now, when in X's presence even the mere word 'salary' is mentioned he will be seen to shudder and excuse himself from the company as soon as he can politely do so. On one or two such occasions, he has even been seized with nausea. Although, regrettably, temptation still lies all around him, he has shown the stuff he is made of. With the further healing that only time can bring, he may one day become an Acadan himself."

III

Academics Anonymous serves not only a rehabilitative but also a protective function. So far, academicism has not made serious inroads within the professional schools; and it is part of the program of AA to see that it does not. However, this surveillance is handled in an enlightened manner. At one time it was stated policy to insist categorically on total abstinence, but it is now generally understood that moderation is the watchword. Those in the professional schools, it is believed, are in no real danger of addiction; and a little indulgence now and then is not likely to do them any harm, other than more or less innocently waste their time. Occasionally, unfortunate accidents do occur, but not in sufficient numbers to warrant any major change in policy.

The focus of academicism is the so-called "liberal arts" college. To quote a prominent Acadan, "If it were generally known far and wide how much shameless and abandoned academic behavior goes on in liberal arts colleges, we would all of us have a better and truer understanding of what is meant by that word 'liberal'!" Some of the less tolerant members of AA have from time to time advocated

¹ A document favoring the adjusted salary, presented not long ago by a group from the left wing, is known jocularly among AA's as the "Whimsy Report."

the outright eradication of the liberal arts college; but the wiser heads feel that it may be better to keep it in the open where it can be watched. Clandestine academicism is particularly virulent, it has been found; it may breed sources of infection that are difficult if not impossible to trace.

The liberal arts addict is by far the most difficult type of case to handle. "Clinical inquisition" invariably points out to him that academicism is economically wasteful, but it is very hard to bring him to the genuine conviction that this is true. In extreme cases he may even exhibit a morbid pride in his condition. Likewise, he seems often to have an uncanny resourcefulness in deceiving those who wish to help him. There are cases on file in which liberal-arts academics have masqueraded as cures and carried on their indulgences for long periods of time without any suspicion from the Acadans. In one very discouraging instance a seeming stalwart who had the entire confidence of the local chapter of AA suddenly published a hopelessly learned book and scandalized not only his own campus but also a teachers college nearby. Setbacks like this, however, only serve to make the organization strong in adversity, and the Acadans work all the harder. The over-all situation was neatly summed up by a speaker before the national convention of AA in 1947 at Peoria: "We have snaked the scotch but have not yet killed it."

The brighter side of the picture indicates that the victory in the professional schools is all but totally complete. "Another twenty years," asserts an influential Acadan on the West Coast, "should see all professional schools of any standing free of academicism—not for a year, not for a lifetime, but forever." Others, less sanguine, predict it may take anywhere from forty years to the better part of a century. All, however, are convinced that Academics Anonymous "has the bugs out of it" and is everywhere—on every campus—a going concern, not just a noble experiment.

EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

By **CLAUDE E. HAWLEY**

United States Office of Education

Education for international understanding is a fundamental responsibility of higher education. It is a responsibility that touches every aspect of the college and university. No field of teaching or research is unrelated to the advancement of international understanding. No one department of a college or university can bear all, or even most, of this responsibility. It is the job of every department and every faculty member.

Such was the declaration, in part, of a recent conference held on June 19-22, 1949, at Estes Park, Colorado, on the Rôle of Higher Education in International Understanding. Under the auspices of the American Council on Education, in cooperation with sixty-seven national educational associations, the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Conference was attended by more than 100 educational leaders, including a number from abroad.¹ In a sense, this meeting was a successor to the International Conference of Universities held in Utrecht, August 2-13, 1948. The implications to the United States of the work done at the latter session were considered in detail by the Estes Park conferees.

II

A resounding second was given to the Utrecht proposal to establish an International Association of Universities. It was unanimously agreed that the stimulation of research into problems of

¹ Representing the American Association of University Professors at this Conference were Dr. Claude E. Hawley, the author of this article, and Dr. Stuart Cuthbertson, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Colorado. The official report of the Conference may be procured from the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C., at \$1.00 a copy.—THE EDITOR

university life and work and the holding of periodic conferences could best be promoted by such an association.

With the diminished number of free universities in the world, the delegates noted, there is a great need to influence public opinion in the direction of helping universities to retain and protect their freedom. An international association can assist greatly in developing a moral conscience for the protection of the freedom of the human spirit. The influence of such an association will be particularly significant if it seeks both to protect the freedom of the individual university and to assist in developing in the universities of the world a sense of their social responsibilities that will reveal itself in the association's official dealings.

The chief function of the proposed association would be to provide a center of cooperation among universities and similar institutions of higher education. The association would periodically choose for investigation problems of international importance to universities, such as student health and welfare, equivalents of entrance qualifications and degrees, academic freedom, university finance, selection of students, methods of teaching, and curriculum reform.

Under the association's supervision would be an International Universities' Bureau, which would collect and disseminate information relating to institutions of higher education throughout the world. The Bureau would promote the interchange of university students and teachers by the dissemination of data regarding scholarships, fellowships, summer courses and staff vacancies, by encouraging the establishment of visiting professorships, and by facilitating travel of professors and students from one country to another. The Bureau would also formulate measures for the better distribution and exchange of laboratory materials, books, and other equipment for university study and research among the countries of the world.

It was agreed that in any general assembly which the International Association of Universities might have the institutions represented would have one vote each without regard to the nation in which the institution was located.

Although it was suggested that UNESCO be requested to support the International Universities' Bureau financially for at least

five years, the conferees made clear that they conceived the proposed association to be a voluntary organization of universities, independent both of national and of intergovernmental organizations. It was stressed that the association's moral influence on the university world would be significant only as long as it guarded its independence and preserved its voluntary character. It would, nevertheless, always seek to achieve maximum cooperation with national and intergovernmental organizations.

III

Pending the organization of an international association, the conferees decided that a National Coordinating Commission be established in the United States. The American Council on Education was requested to undertake the task of organizing such a Commission, and satisfactory progress in that direction is now being made. The Coordinating Commission will serve as a central clearing house for information on all international educational activities. To facilitate the work of the Commission in collecting and disseminating facts and ideas, the Conference recommended that each college and university in the Nation establish a central office to collect information and to coordinate the activities on its own campus which emphasize the international aspects of education, culture, and science. Such offices would assist college administrators, staff, and students, and furnish a point of contact for outside groups.

An initial activity of the Commission will probably be that of taking a national inventory of the resources of colleges and universities for educational exchanges. Possibilities of joint action among the institutions of higher learning of the country in the area of international education will also be explored.

The Coordinating Commission will serve as a liaison between the institutions of higher education in the United States and governmental agencies, such as the Department of State, the United States National Commission for UNESCO, the United Nations and its allied agencies, and foreign diplomatic missions in this country. Since it is manifestly impossible for such intergovernmental agencies to distribute pertinent information to the more than

1800 colleges and universities individually, the Commission can usefully gather and collate data, adapt it to educational purposes, and disseminate it in a useful form. The Commission may also be expected to encourage students and faculty members to participate in studies of intergovernmental programs, which should yield rich materials for research projects.

The many voluntary organizations concerned with international understanding can serve the colleges and universities more effectively by dealing with one agency, such as the proposed National Coordinating Commission, rather than separately with the institutions themselves. Among the voluntary organizations whose services now need coordination are the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the World Student Christian Federation, the World Union of Jewish Students, Pax Romana, the American Association for the United Nations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Social Science Research Council, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Student Project for Amity Among Nations, Rotary International, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Hazen Foundation, and similar organizations. It was recommended that the Commission prepare a directory of such agencies and evaluate their work for the convenience of students and educators who use their services.

IV

The Estes Park Conference agreed unanimously that if the United States is to play a leading rôle in international affairs, as apparently it must, trained persons must be readily available to assume the Nation's many new responsibilities. Our obligations in such world agencies as United Nations and UNESCO, our voluntary commitments such as those involved in our ECA activities, and our opportunities to promote friendly trade and cultural intercourse with other nations all require a greatly increased supply of educated personnel.

It was noted that changing world conditions have brought with them a need for different qualitative considerations in educating persons to represent American interests abroad. The self-con-

scious, self-seeking American, living in isolation even while physically abroad, no longer meets today's needs. The American representative of the future, it was agreed, must be a person of breadth of vision and understanding. His advocacy of democratic ideals at home must find expression in his life and activities abroad. Education must help him prepare for his new relationships and responsibilities.

The shocking lack of information regarding the supply of personnel with special training and the demands that our economy and our world-wide responsibilities are likely to place on our resources of such personnel must be remedied at once, the delegates said. It is obviously impossible for the universities and colleges to meet their obligations to provide personnel to fill national needs if they do not have the necessary information about how many of what kind are required. Only in a few fields, such as the sciences and engineering, is any substantial effort being made at the present time to provide an inventory of the national resources of specialized personnel. It was urged that the National Coordinating Commission, when it is organized, give top priority to personnel supply and demand studies.

The Conference suggested a number of ways in which institutions of higher learning might increase both the quantity and quality of specialized personnel for positions bearing on international understanding. Orientation courses might be provided for those about to go abroad. These courses could supply the travellers with some understanding of the customs and economy of the nation to be visited. Special training courses, particularly in the languages, politics, economics, and geography of foreign countries, are likewise useful. Institutions of higher learning ought also to consider their obligations for training foreign nationals in connection with some of the foreign assistance programs in effect or being contemplated by the United States Government. The Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act, the European Recovery Program, and the suggested "Point 4" program are all apt to increase the demand for college courses dealing with foreign nations and affairs.

The Conference considered the case of college teachers and administrators who, because of their special training, are frequently

found to be extraordinarily useful abroad. The delegates believed that it is imperative that institutions of higher education be generous in granting leaves of absence, even to the point of sacrifice, to teachers and administrators who wish to take foreign service assignments. Ultimately, it was suggested, such leaves redound to the benefit of the institutions themselves.

The language and area programs in colleges and universities were examined by the conferees, and it was agreed that when properly conducted, they provide an excellent means of disseminating organized knowledge about an area and of directing research along fruitful lines. The tendency among institutions of higher learning to coordinate their programs in order to prevent unnecessary duplication and in order further to concentrate the best talent available on a given area was highly commended.

The Conference believed that a limited number of universities should establish courses at the graduate level in international public administration. The aims of such courses would be to train a small corps of career personnel for service in international administration, to supplement the knowledge of those preparing for careers in the administration of American foreign policy, and to provide an understanding and appreciation of the general field for intelligent citizens.

V

Considerable attention was given to the matter of "general education for international understanding." The curriculum, the advisory system, and extracurricular activities were considered.

All students, it was agreed, regardless of the profession for which they may be preparing, should have an appreciation of foreign cultures and an understanding interest in the peoples of other lands. Future chemists, geologists, biologists, doctors, and lawyers, as well as historians, political scientists, and linguists must become informed citizens and active participants in the formulation and operation of their country's foreign policy. It was concluded, therefore, that matters bearing on international understanding must permeate the entire curriculum of our colleges and universities. The scientific work of the World Health Organization, the agricul-

tural and dietetic research of the Food and Agricultural Organization, the activities of the International Bank and Monetary Fund and of the various regional economic commissions of the United Nations should be studied as an essential part of their respective subject matter fields, in the same way that atomic energy is introduced into modern civics courses.

Over and above the elements of international understanding that will be injected into existing courses, it was agreed that every institution should offer a basic course in international understanding or international affairs for all students. Its purpose would be to make clear the social, economic, and political forces that must be analyzed and controlled if we are to realize a peaceful world society in our time.

Recognition was given the fact that an increasing number of students are specializing in international relations with no particular thought of employment in the field, but rather as a means of informing themselves about the world around them. It was recommended that such students have access to courses leading to proficiency in the reading, writing, and speaking of modern foreign languages, studies in comparative culture, world literature, and the fine arts, and background courses in history, economics, politics, and geography.

Teacher training was considered, and it was agreed that every teacher should make international understanding one of his objectives regardless of his field of specialization. For those already teaching, in-service training programs were recommended. Workshops, staff meetings, temporary employment in international organizations, and sabbaticals were all recommended to further the international understanding of teachers.

The teaching of international understanding was recognized as a new curriculum area. It was therefore suggested that careful consideration be given to evaluating new approaches to the field.

In the realm of extra-curricular activities, it was recommended that facilities for foreign students on domestic campuses be enlarged and that opportunities for American students to go abroad be increased. It was suggested that all foreign contacts of universities and colleges, as in the postwar relief and reconstruction program, be coordinated by some central agency, such as the pro-

posed National Coordinating Commission. The establishment of foreign language houses and the continuation of personal contacts by American students with students abroad by correspondence are to be encouraged.

The Conference urged that each college and university deliberately maintain a balance, according to the facilities it has to offer, among the several categories of students and professors regularly coming to the United States from abroad. These categories include those who fit into the reconstruction program in the occupied areas; those from countries in which Fulbright programs are in progress; those from neighboring countries, which we tend to neglect except in time of crisis; and displaced persons. It was further recommended that an appropriate committee consolidate the most pertinent information essential to the exchange of persons, probably in the form of a booklet.

VI

Institutions of higher education of all sizes, the conferees agreed, have a direct responsibility for programs of adult education in their communities. Faculty members are in a strategic position not only to give classroom instruction but to cooperate in many ways in the self-education of the community. Aside from disseminating information, educators can be of significant assistance in helping members of the community to develop judgment about international affairs and to encourage active participation in world events. This may be done through class and correspondence instruction, lectures, institutes, forums, conferences, cooperation with nonuniversity study groups, films, radio, and the press.

Vigorous efforts should be made to emphasize the direct relationship between international problems and local problems and interests, and to inculcate knowledge about the cultural, social, and political values involved in understanding world economic interdependency.

Colleges and universities could usefully draw upon the adult education experiences in international understanding of the Community Ambassador programs of New York State, the Institute of Foreign Trade, the Student Project for Amity Among Nations,

and UNESCO. The Community Ambassador program involves the selection of young speakers who have completed their formal schooling and have returned to their communities after a summer abroad. The Annual Institute for Foreign Trade, under the supervision of St. Louis University, brings together representatives of such businesses as banks, steamship companies, and railroads to discuss topics of common interest centering around foreign trade. The Student Project for Amity Among Nations, sponsored by the University of Minnesota, makes available students who have travelled abroad for speeches and conferences throughout the State.

UNESCO sponsors community councils in rural areas and cities alike to enable the individual citizen to work more effectively toward the world conditions he wants. The rôle of higher education in such projects is as significant as local institutions choose to make it.

VII

At a final plenary session, members of the Estes Park Conference unanimously endorsed the present cooperation in international cultural relations between the United States Government and the colleges and universities of the country. They maintained that this cooperation is a new enterprise which holds great promise for the improvement of international understanding. The Conference expressed particular satisfaction with the policy set forth in the Smith-Mundt Act that in international educational, scientific, and cultural relations the government shall utilize to the fullest extent possible the existing educational institutions of the country. It was noted that the government's policy has been completely consonant with the basic principles of higher education, namely, scrupulous regard for educational integrity, the unrestricted search for truth, and the building of relations with other peoples and nations upon mutual agreement and reciprocity of interests.

BOOKS AND CULTURAL RECONSTRUCTION

UNESCO and CARE Work Together

By JAIME TORRES BODET

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

A book is every man's passport to education, science, and culture. It opens the realms of ideas and knowledge for him when and as he wants. Unlike the newspapers, books do not tell him what to think at breakfast on some precise "today's date" or, like radio, compel him to attend at some set hour; and thus, because books are friends to come for entertainment or instruction at the wanted moment, their power is vast and enduring. Perhaps, too, this is why books, although among the first of all the commodities of civilization to be mass-produced, have never yet been produced in sufficient quantities to meet more than a fraction of the world's demand, and why it has been necessary to create a complex system of libraries to lend the limited supply around, and why now, between four and five years after the close of the war, the question of book supply is one of the most important and vast of any that UNESCO and all bodies that are concerned with the intellectual, social, and spiritual welfare of the world have to face.

It is certainly difficult, it may even be impossible, for an American, in a country where books are abundant and library services well developed and efficient, to understand the full meaning of the phrase that UNESCO has often used: "the book famine." The war not only destroyed many millions of books, it impoverished communities; it deprived their library professions of recruits and, at the same time that it thus weakened their cultural resources, presented them with vaster problems of educational, scientific and cultural development than had ever been known in the world before. The libraries we are attempting to stock are not only those dealing with the remote and exclusive question of research and higher studies; they are the libraries for the ordinary people:

the mother who wants books on child care; the farmer, the engineer, on the new techniques of their work; the school teacher who must keep abreast of world opinion; all of these, and every other man, woman and child. All these communities need books as part of the apparatus of living. Without them, they cannot possibly play their full and active part in the creative life of their place and time. Figures mean little: it is the quality rather than the quantity of the loss that is important; but perhaps it means something to say that one public library in Greece, the library of Corfu, lost 70,000 books, all its collection; that the City of London College lost the whole of its collection of books on economics, accounting, law, modern foreign languages—the fundamental basis of this institution's studies. The public library in Milan lost 200,000 books; almost the whole of the collection of the University of Rangoon was destroyed. The list could be endless without even mentioning some of the most dramatic and most widely advertised losses, such as those of the University of Warsaw, or the Catholic University of Louvain, or the British Museum. This is a measure of the incalculably vast task which UNESCO is attempting to fulfill.

II

In the last few months, UNESCO has found in CARE a bountiful ally in its task of helping to supply books and periodicals to libraries and individuals in many countries which cannot meet their own need.

The CARE scheme, even if at this stage it is limited to the supply of books of one country, and in limited subject areas, can make a significant and large contribution to break the worldwide book famine. Already in past years, by the supply of food and clothing, CARE has made vast contributions to educational, scientific, and cultural construction because these material and basic needs must be satisfied if education, science, and culture are to develop at all: a hungry and inadequately clothed being is scarcely able to think or work efficiently; but now, by its campaign for the supply of books, CARE is coming right into the center of the UNESCO task in a big and open-hearted way.

There can be few Americans who know nothing of CARE and its work, as many millions have already contributed to its food and clothing schemes; so there is probably no need to describe the mechanism of CARE. This article attempts only to give the picture of the need as it is evident to UNESCO, and will say something of the way in which the present CARE book scheme will dove-tail into UNESCO's program, and will enlarge and strengthen it.

At the start of UNESCO's work, the word "Reconstruction" was interpreted somewhat literally to refer only to war-damaged countries and to actual libraries which had been bombed or pillaged, but fairly quickly UNESCO began to re-interpret "reconstruction" into terms of "construction." The fact that a particular library has been destroyed or damaged does not necessarily mean that it should have priority in a reconstruction program. It may be infinitely more necessary to help the development of some entirely new library that never existed before the war and which is actively giving service to those parts of contemporary life which are most immediately relevant to existing social, economic, educational, scientific, and cultural development. Similarly, a library does not necessarily most want the replacement of lost books but may prefer the supply of entirely new ones. It is a main task of the UNESCO's Libraries Division to discover and evaluate needs in these terms of construction, and all that UNESCO knows will of course be directly available to CARE.

Also in recent months there has been a big shift of emphasis in UNESCO programs toward meeting the needs of underdeveloped countries. UNESCO is actively concerned to understand library needs and to help to meet them in countries such as India or Haiti, in Latin American states or some colonial territories where progressive administration and lively development programs necessitate good library services; and these it may be hoped will come within the scope of CARE benevolence.

UNESCO has little money directly at its disposal to spend on book purchases; and, indeed, the General Conference has never been willing to recognize wide responsibilities as a donor. It has been suggested, sometimes, that UNESCO's main reconstruction responsibility is to act as a stimulator of benevolence, and undoubt-

edly big things can be done by drawing attention to needs in a general way so that others will come forward to meet them; but the real proof of UNESCO's service is to be found not merely in the vocal and dramatic expression of needs but in the practical help which can be given to agencies such as CARE by providing them with detailed and accurate information and by making UNESCO's own wide experience of needs in its member states available so that programs can be directed, as the CARE scheme is being directed, in close accord with the aims and ideals of UNESCO.

In the course of the past years UNESCO's Libraries Division has built up vast files of exact information about library needs, all of which is available to CARE, to help assure that CARE gifts will be of the kind that are most wanted and will go where they will be most useful. This is a very practical and positive contribution to CARE work and to the member states which will benefit.

In the general question of reconstruction policy UNESCO has stated for itself one basic principle, of which the accurate collation and assessment of information about needs is a practical demonstration, namely, that to the greatest possible extent the choice of what they receive should lie with the recipients. It is not UNESCO's business to say what people should or should not read, but to give them freedom to read in accordance with their own interpretation of needs.

III

There are also, of course, the deeper and more fundamental ideals of UNESCO of which CARE activity is a practical fulfillment. International understanding can grow only if people have the means which books provide to study the life and thought and benefit from the expression of their neighbors.

CARE, in its present program, is concentrating on exactly those classes of new publications in scientific, medical, and technical fields which are most wanted, and these are fields in which the wonders of American progress can be most vividly expressed, and by means of which America can contribute most creatively to world advancement.

Reference has been made above to the UNESCO belief that ideally the choice of what books they receive should lie, as far as possible, with the recipients. Every librarian, from the very nature of his responsibilities, agrees with this, but it is an extremely difficult policy to carry out because the information services or bibliographical services, which provide the only means by which librarians can exercise a deliberate choice, too often do not exist, or existing bibliographies are inadequately distributed. A big drive is being made by UNESCO to increase and improve the supply of bibliographies, and CARE will help substantially by the inclusion of bibliographies as one of the classes of publication to which priority attention is to be given in the first phase of its book scheme.

Quite apart, however, from the impossibility of free choice without bibliographies to tell the would-be recipients what is available, there are, of course, the barriers to free choice of poverty and currency restrictions. Any donor to CARE can know that the books or periodicals he sends will have been chosen by a committee of wise librarians all of whom have travelled, and who know the world and the needs of their colleagues, the librarians, in reconstruction and in underdeveloped countries. In the background are CARE's own representatives in all the countries which will benefit, who will keep in touch with the recipient universities and research institutes not only to learn what they need, but also to keep CARE well informed about the use being made of the books which CARE donors send and to encourage the recipient libraries to make the books as fully and efficiently available as any American with his own well-developed library service would expect. And cooperating with CARE in every stage of the growth of the program is UNESCO with its widespread and intimate contacts with the individual readers of books and the institutions and libraries in all fields of education, science, and culture.

The CARE scheme opens a wide door for gifts to pass from one part of the world to many others. It enables Americans to make a large part of their wealth of ideas and knowledge and experience freely available; and in return it will undoubtedly help to bring back to America not only the lasting good will of people in other countries, but all that they, in their turn, have to offer of their

wealth of ideas, knowledge, and experience. In all this donors to CARE will be making a practical contribution to the fulfillment of UNESCO's charter obligations to improve international understanding and thereby contribute to the maintenance of world peace.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH A CHAPTER OFFICER

October 13, 1949

Dear Mr. Himstead:

As president for this year of the Cooper Union Chapter of the AAUP, I have been asked by two of our members to write you requesting clarification of the organization's stand in regard to communism and the employment of teachers who are members of the Communist Party, or who are sympathetic to it.

These members of our faculty have been caused some misgivings by the "Report of Committee A for 1948" in the Spring, 1949 AAUP *Bulletin*, especially pages 56-58, and by news items in the *New York Times* and *Journal-American*, of which I enclose copies. If you could give a fuller explanation of the committee's report to supplement our own interpretation and give it an authoritative basis, we are sure that this uneasiness could be allayed.

Since our first meeting of the year is scheduled for October 24, with a discussion of the AAUP's stand on communism as part of the agenda, we should be grateful if we could have something from you by that time.

Professor Eichler, our program chairman, is writing to ask about the possibility of your giving us a talk sometime during the coming year. All of us hope that you may find it convenient to do so, and we should be honored to have you with us.

Sincerely yours,
LEROY H. BUCKINGHAM

October 20, 1949

Dear Professor Buckingham:

I have your letter of October 13 in which you request a statement clarifying the "stand" of the American Association of University Professors "in regard to communism and the employment of teachers who are members of the Communist Party, or who are

sympathetic to it" for your use at a meeting of the Cooper Union Chapter of the Association on October 24.

The Association as such has taken no "stand" in reference to the subject of your request. The viewpoints on this subject that were attributed to the Association in press reports of last July as an official Association pronouncement were those of the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. These press reports were occasioned by the publication of the Spring, 1949 issue of the Association's *Bulletin*, which, as you will recall, was greatly delayed. The several press associations and many newspapers were deeply interested in the investigation by Committee A of the dismissal of Professor Parker from the Faculty of Evansville College, and had requested copies of the Spring issue of the Association's *Bulletin* in which the report of this investigation was published. In scrutinizing this report, representatives of the press became interested in the principles of academic freedom and tenure, and particularly in the work of Committee A, with the result that they read the Annual Report of Committee A for 1948, which also appeared in the current Spring issue of the Association's *Bulletin*. This report, as you know, had previously been presented to the Annual Meeting of the Association late in February. Mistakenly or otherwise, some of the representatives of the press reported the Annual Report of Committee A for 1948 as "spot news" of official action by the Association, comparable to the action of the annual convention of the National Education Association earlier in July.

II

During the past three years Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure has given careful consideration to the factor of Communist Party membership in relation to the principles of academic freedom and tenure. In the Annual Reports of the Committee for 1947 and 1948 there are sections concerned with this subject. You will note from these sections that the views of the Committee expressed therein were developed during prolonged study and deliberation by the Active members of the Committee and jointly by the Active members of the Committee and the Council of the Association. You will note that these views were reaffirmed

by the Council of the Association without dissent at a meeting of that body late in October, 1948. You will note also that at the time these views were being formulated and expressed the Committee did not have under consideration any actual case in which the factor of Communist Party membership was presented, but that it now has such a situation under consideration. In reference to this latter point, please note what is said in the next to the last paragraph of the Report of the Committee for 1948:

This report, like all previous annual reports of the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, represents the views of the Active members of the Committee who share the responsibility for the day-to-day work of the Association relating to the principles of academic freedom and tenure. Apropos of the viewpoints in reference to communism expressed in this report and in the Report of the Committee for 1947, it should be noted that in the development of these viewpoints the Committee did not have before it for consideration any actual case. The Committee is mindful that legal experience has demonstrated that there are some risks in the formulation of opinions and judgments based upon abstract situations in that these may have been formulated without sufficient facts and without benefits of opposing arguments, and that they may prove to be inapplicable in their entirety to a specific set of facts. As stated in the report, Committee A now has under consideration actual cases in which there is a factor of communism. In the consideration of these cases the Committee is functioning in a strictly judicial role, *i.e.*, it is scrutinizing the facts and circumstances of each case and is receiving and evaluating the arguments and viewpoints of all the parties concerned. The gravity of the issue and the significance of the principles involved in these cases make a punctilious observance of the judicial process in their consideration imperative as regards the welfare of the profession.

I hope that all of the members of the Cooper Union Chapter of the Association will read the Annual Reports of Committee A for 1947 and 1948. As indicated above, the Annual Report of the Committee for 1948 appears in the current (1949) Spring issue of the Association's *Bulletin*. The Annual Report of the Committee for 1947 was published in the Spring, 1948 issue of the Association's *Bulletin*. As stated in the paragraph from the Annual Report of Committee A for 1948, quoted above, these two reports, like all

the Annual Reports of Committee A, speak for the Committee, which means they speak for the Committee only. Nothing in these two Reports can be construed as implying that they speak for the membership of the Association.

In this connection it should be kept clearly in mind that basic in the philosophy of the American Association of University Professors is belief in and support of freedom of opinion, judgment, action, and association for the individual, both in the profession at large and in the Association. In his relationships in the Association, the individual member has complete freedom as regards his political, economic, social, and religious views and affiliations. He also has complete freedom to differ in opinion with other members of the Association and with any actions taken by the several committees, the Council, and the Annual Meeting of the Association. This principle of freedom for the individual member has been adhered to throughout the history of the Association. No effort has ever been made by the Association's Annual Meeting, by its Council, or by any of its committees to speak for the membership of the Association as a whole. The Annual Meeting speaks for the Annual Meeting. The Council speaks for the Council. The committees speak for the committees. This Association respects the rights of its members to hold and to express whatever views their thinking may lead them to. *It is concurrence in this philosophy of individual freedom that constitutes the basis of unity in the Association. Membership in the Association neither involves nor implies any other commitment—ideological or otherwise.* If the Association should ever disregard this basic principle and seek by organizational directives to control or to inhibit the freedom of its members, it will have departed from a principle, the observance of which is essential to the professional concept of teaching and research and the professional character of the Association.

III

A careful reading of the Reports of Committee A for 1947 and 1948 will make it clear that nothing in these two Reports can be construed as an expression of belief in or support of communism or Communist régimes, or an unawareness of the nature of communism and Communist régimes. None of the members of the

Committee believes in or supports, or has ever believed in or supported, Communism. All are opposed to the theory of communism and the philosophy and practices of Communist governments. All are aware of the nature of communism and of Communist régimes. All are also aware of the facts of the present international situation.

In considering the factor of communism in the academic profession, Committee A was not concerned with communism *per se* in the sense that it sought to pass judgment on either the theory of communism or Communist régimes. The concern of the Committee was with the principles of academic freedom and tenure in the United States in relation to the right of an individual member of the profession in the United States to his own views on communism, and with the professional propriety of his affiliating with the Communist Party in the United States in the light of the facts then known to the Committee. Prolonged study and deliberation led the Committee to the conclusion that, in addition to other pertinent considerations, it would be unwise for institutions of higher education in this country to emulate Communist régimes in one of their worst practices, namely, the repression of freedom of thought and association. In reaching this conclusion the Committee had in mind *bona fide* members of the academic profession, conscientious in the performance of their professional duties and whose political activities, if any, are open and lawful. Nothing in the Reports of the Committee for 1947 and 1948 gives countenance to infiltration of the profession by persons whose purpose is inculcation of the doctrines of communism, or the promotion of the interests of the Communist Party. Nothing in these Reports gives countenance to participation by members of the academic profession in covert or conspiratorial subversive activities. These Reports make it clear that members of the academic profession who are members of the Communist Party or Communist-front organizations and who use their classes as forums for propaganda or their other relationships with students for propaganda, or whose professional performance makes it clear that their acceptance of Communist ideology has destroyed their scholarly objectivity, or who engage in other subversive activities, should be dismissed for these reasons on the grounds of professional unfitness, provided that

these grounds are established by evidence in a manner which assures the teacher concerned a full measure of due process pursuant to the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure.

The test of a principle is in a crisis. The tests of the principles of freedom vouchsafed us in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution always come during periods regarded by some as crises, in which it is argued by some that the principles are not applicable because the situation is unusual. In the adjudication of cases and controversies in such situations the courts must decide whether or not principles heretofore followed are applicable. In the main the courts of this country, particularly the Federal courts, guided as they are by the Constitutional principles of freedom and due process which are interpreted in the light of the common law with its assurance to the individual of due process, have been bulwarks of freedom. In upholding the principles of freedom in such situations, the courts, by virtue of perspective in large part a result of conversance with the history of freedom, have frequently pointed out that principles of law are developed for the purpose of coping with unusual situations and also that what is regarded by some as a crisis may in fact not be a crisis at all. The Annual Reports of Committee A for 1947 and 1948 make it clear that, in the light of the facts then known to the Committee, it was the considered judgment of the Committee that the factor of communism in the academic profession did not warrant either the abandonment of the long-standing principle in Anglo-American law that guilt is personal or the abandonment of the well-established principles of academic freedom and tenure, which assure the maximum of freedom for the individual, limited only by the bounds of professional and civic propriety and a full measure of due process to the individual in situations in which his exercise of freedom is called in question.

Apropos of these views that have been expressed by Committee A, I invite your consideration and that of the other members of the Chapter of an editorial in the *News and Observer*, Raleigh, North Carolina, of July 13, 1949, entitled "Freedom Rule," a copy of which I enclose. Apropos of the Report of Committee A on the Evansville College situation, I invite your consideration and that

of the other members of the Chapter of an editorial from the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Kentucky, of July 19, 1949, entitled "If a College Can't Afford Freedom It's Poor Indeed," a copy of which is also enclosed. In this connection I also invite thoughtful consideration of the viewpoints expressed in articles pertaining to freedom in the current Summer issue of the Association's *Bulletin*, particularly the address "What Price Freedom?" by Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago; the statement by Mr. Laird Bell, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, entitled "Are We Afraid of Freedom?"; and the letter of Mr. Grenville Clark, Fellow of Harvard College to Mr. Frank B. Ober of Baltimore, Maryland, under date of May 27, 1949, in the correspondence published under the caption "Freedom at Harvard."

IV

The views expressed by Committee A in reference to the factor of Communist Party membership in relation to the principles of academic freedom and tenure have received both favorable and unfavorable editorial comment. With but few exceptions the adverse comment has been to the effect that while the views of the Committee are in keeping with the American tradition of freedom they are unrealistic.

In considering this comment, it is important that we understand the meanings of the terms "realism," "realistic," and "realist." Realism means preoccupation with reality as opposed to idealistic or sentimental attitude, policy, principles, etc. It means the disposition to think and act in the light of things as they are and to repudiate "visionary schemes." Realistic means of or pertaining to, or after the manner of, realism. A realist is one who adheres to or is an advocate of realism. As used in this connection the term means one who, in dealing with members of the academic profession who are members of the Communist Party, would disregard ideals and principles. He is one who believes that the end justifies the means. The pertinent question here is whether the means, namely, acting pursuant to the formula of guilt by association, *i. e.*, membership in the Communist Party, will achieve the end sought, namely, protecting our institutions of higher education from the

acts of subversive teachers. I submit that they will not. I believe that the only way we can deal effectively with the subversive teacher is to act in accordance with the well-established legal principle that guilt is personal, which means that we proceed against the individual for his unprofessional or subversive acts. To proceed against a teacher pursuant to the formula of guilt by association is to ignore all persons not in a particular organization, in this case the Communist Party, who may be guilty of subversive acts. Specifically this formula ignores the crypto-Communists and the fellow-travellers. To act on the formula of guilt by association therefore is to act unrealistically. Such action is unrealistic also because it does not take cognizance of the fact that a teacher whose purpose is to inculcate Communist doctrines and to use his professional position to that end will not hesitate to dissociate himself from the Communist Party if membership in that Party becomes a liability in achieving his purpose. Such a teacher would also not hesitate to conceal the fact of his membership in the Communist Party or to falsely deny that he is a member.

Committee A has given considerable thought to the matter of why some members of the academic profession have endorsed the formula of guilt by association. The human personality is exceedingly complex and it is difficult to determine motivation. It has been suggested that the administrations of some institutions of higher education have endorsed this formula out of consideration of public relations and that this consideration has also motivated individuals in their endorsement of the formula. Be that as it may, the simplicity of the formula, the ease with which it can be understood, and the fact that it is popular, all conduce to its acceptance. The formula, guilt by association, is simple not only in the sense that it is easy to understand but also in the sense that it is elementary—too elementary to be a safe guide in coping with complex situations in which there may be a factor of Communist subversiveness. The formula ignores the realities of such situations, and to ignore realities is to act unrealistically.

The formula, guilt by association, is not only too elementary to be effective, but it is also dangerous—dangerous because those who endorse it are in effect inviting legislatures to assist in finding members of the academic profession who are members of the Com-

munist Party by such means as un-American activities investigations, teachers oath laws, examination of textbooks by legislative committees, and kindred measures. The rationale of this formula is the rationale of un-American activities investigations, teachers oath laws, and legislative examination of textbooks, all of which are inimical to the integrity of our educational institutions. It is also because of this consideration and other pertinent considerations, discussed in the Report of Committee A for 1947, that we of the Committee regard the formula, guilt by association, and those who endorse it, as lacking in realism.

The formula, guilt by association, is an *ad hoc* formula. *Ad hoc* formulae are likely to ignore realities which make them unsafe guides in coping with practicalities. *Ad hoc* formulae disregard principles and the values that are derived from the observance of principles which makes any action pursuant to them highly injudicious. To disregard principles is to impair these principles for all time to come and also to impair confidence in the institutions that have been founded upon and developed pursuant to these principles.

The views of the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure which I have restated in this letter are in keeping with the American principles of freedom. American institutions were founded upon and have been developed in accordance with these principles. Repression is alien to our institutions. It is at home only in lands governed by autocratic régimes. Its only advocates are the conscious or unwitting votaries of the philosophy of dictatorship. Whether or not we of this country are to abandon these principles of freedom, the observance of which has developed the great American tradition of freedom, the ultimate responsibility for such decisions is the responsibility of our legislatures and our courts. It is not the responsibility of the academic profession. Institutions of higher education should never seek to usurp the functions of legislatures and the courts, and if they value their rôle in a free society they must never give encouragement to any movement to abandon the principles of freedom.

At this critical juncture of history, when the hopes of the Western world are based on freedom, and when we of this country are contributing billions of dollars to strengthen the free nations of Western

Europe, it is important—very important—that we of this country evidence our confidence in the principles of freedom which we espouse and to which we are so deeply committed. We of the academic profession in this country have a great responsibility in the matter of clarifying for the American public the meaning and the values of freedom and of assuring our colleagues abroad, particularly those in the educational institutions of Western Europe, that we do believe in freedom, that we do have confidence in free institutions, that we are fully aware of the risks of freedom, but that we regard these risks as nothing compared with the risks of repression, thus giving our colleagues abroad moral support which they so greatly need in their efforts to achieve stable governments and educational institutions based on freedom.

I have referred to the risks of freedom “as nothing compared with the risks of repression.” In support of this statement I submit the history of repression and invite the members of our profession who are afraid of freedom to recall or to study this history. The history of repression makes it clear that repressive measures have never contributed to governmental stability. Repressive governments may achieve stability temporarily but they inevitably result in disaffection among the people which leads to instability. The reason is clear. Repression ignores the values of freedom and the salient fact that the desire for freedom is strong and widespread, and that when this desire is repressed a conflict is created that is irrepressible. What are the values of freedom that make for stability? Freedom encourages individual responsibility, repression irresponsibility. Freedom creates an atmosphere conducive to the development of wholesome character and normal personality. Repression warps character and personality. Freedom encourages forthrightness, honesty, and confidence in justice. Repression invites conspiracy and deceit. Individual responsibility, wholesome character, normal personality, forthrightness, honesty, and confidence in justice—all these attributes are essential to stability. The road of freedom is the road to stability. It is the road away from revolution. That at least is the theory of our Constitutional system which, incidentally, it is well to remind ourselves, is one of the oldest and the strongest in the world. In devising our Constitutional system, the founding fathers were fully

aware of the risks of freedom. They were students of history. They chose freedom because of their awareness of the greater risks of repression. In choosing freedom they provided appropriate safeguards against the abuse of freedom, safeguards that assure the individual, whose exercise of freedom is called in question, the protection of due process of law. In our institutions of higher education, in addition to the Constitutional safeguards against the abuse of freedom, there are the safeguards provided by the principles of academic freedom that have been developed by the custom and usage of the academic world: principles that have the support of a responsible profession prepared to apply appropriate restraints to a misuse of freedom. To these principles, both Constitutional and academic, the American Association of University Professors is deeply committed.

I wish that it were possible for me to act on your suggestion that I visit the Cooper Union Chapter of the Association during the coming year. I doubt, however, that it will be possible for me to do so. The volume of the work of this office, always large, has during recent years reached unprecedentedly large proportions. The correspondence of this office alone entails the handling of over 100,000 letters a year, approximately 20,000 of which are concerned with the professional work of the Association. The professional correspondence of this office cannot be delegated to the staff of secretarial assistants, as is the bulk of the organizational correspondence with members and Chapters. The professional work of this office also entails participation by the members of the professional staff, Dr. Shannon and myself, in hundreds of office conferences and in many educational conferences each year. In addition to this, we of the professional staff have the responsibility of editing the Association's *Bulletin*. It is our hope that in the not too distant future the Association will have a membership sufficiently large to provide a budget that will enable the Association to increase the size of its professional staff, thus making Chapter visitation possible. As of the present we of this office cannot visit more than two or three Chapters a year. In this connection, I have a suggestion to make, namely, that the Chapter encourage its members to read the Association's *Bulletin*. Every issue of this publication carries articles or addresses or reports that are

significant and of concern to every member of the profession. I also suggest that, in lieu of a visiting speaker, the Chapter designate some of its members to review at Chapter meetings significant articles, addresses, and reports published in the *Bulletin*, the reviews to be followed by forum discussion.

With kindest regards and best wishes for the success of the Cooper Union Chapter of the Association, I am

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

Enclosures

Freedom Rule¹

Professor William T. Laprade of Duke University and his committee of the American Association of University Professors are entitled to the gratitude of all freedom-loving people in America for standing up straight in a time of hysteria and declaring that a professor may not be fired merely because of unpopular opinions.

The Laprade committee passed a resolution of censure of Evansville College of Evansville, Indiana, which discharged a teacher because he supported Progressive Party Candidate Henry Wallace in the 1948 election.²

The college claimed that Parker, by publicly espousing Wallace's cause had jeopardized the school's interests in a "conservative community on which it depends in a large degree for its financial support." It would be a pretty tragic thing in this country if to get money our colleges were frankly ready to sell their freedom for endowments. The Laprade committee properly declared that "an institution of higher learning in which freedom of teaching and research do not exist is unworthy of the name."

The committee, however, went further and drew a distinction which should never be forgotten even in these times full of fears. It held that, "so long as the Communist Party in the United States is a legal political party," a teacher has a right to belong to it, though

¹ Editorial published in the Raleigh, North Carolina *News and Observer* (Jonathan Daniels, Editor), July 13, 1949.

² This reference is to the Committee's Report on Evansville College and the Committee's recommendation (not "resolution") of censure of the Administration of the College. Beginning with paragraph 4 the editorial has reference principally to the Annual Report of Committee A for 1948.—THE EDITORS

it simultaneously held that proved disloyalty constitutes ground for dismissal. This is the distinction which should never be forgotten. Any American, teacher or anybody else, has a right to any opinion or faith and to join any legal party. That is the sacred American right of freedom of opinion. If he is disloyal, the disloyalty must be demonstrable under the equally precious American doctrine that a man is only guilty when he is proved guilty. The difference between unpopular opinions and disloyalty is absolute. And if the day should ever come when a man who holds unpopular opinions may be fired without proof of disloyalty, then academic freedom and every other type of freedom will be gone.

Certainly this does not mean that any teacher has a freedom to impose his opinions on his students or use his classroom as a forum for the dissemination of his own political opinions. Most American Communists not only hold unpopular opinions but also are crackpots to boot and there is no rule of academic freedom which requires any institution to keep a crackpot who confuses objective teaching with the right to impose his opinions upon his students. Such a professor would be a poor teacher regardless of whether he was a Democrat, a Republican, a Communist, a Single Taxer, or a Townsendite. It is not necessary to prove that a bum teacher is a disloyal one as well. But when the time comes that a teacher is automatically subject to discharge for belonging to a legally recognized political party, then no teacher of any party will be safe.

The rule drawn by Dr. Laprade and his associates needs steady remembrance: Any American teacher has the right to any opinion, and the right to support it equally as a citizen. And the only place to put a limit upon freedom of opinion is at the point of proved disloyalty. That may seem to many fearful persons to be giving greater emphasis to old freedoms than new fears. It does. When the time comes that we are ready to reject our freedoms to serve our fears, we will have come to the very tyrannies we oppose.

If a College Can't Afford Freedom It's Poor Indeed¹

If Indiana were a state of the Soviet Union, nobody would have been surprised last year when Evansville College fired a professor

¹ Editorial published in the *Louisville Courier-Journal* (Barry Bingham, Editor), July 19, 1949; reprinted in the *Chicago Sun Times*, July 25, 1949.

for his political views and activities. The only surprise would have been that any professor in Russia had dared to have a mind of his own and to show it.

But since Indiana is one of the 48 United States, where academic freedom is a proud boast and a traditional necessity in the search for truth and for the production of "the inquiring mind" without which education is meaningless, a great many people were both surprised and appalled. And they said so, from coast to coast.

Now "Committee A" of the American Association of University Professors, after long investigation, has backed up the original spontaneous indignation with a resolution strongly censuring Evansville College.¹ In firing Dr. George Parker admittedly only because he was supporting Henry A. Wallace for the Presidency in April, 1948, the college, the committee held, unjustifiably violated academic freedom and the rules of job tenure.

The committee found that various community interests—veterans' organizations, business and civic leaders, and others—had pressured the college into firing Dr. Parker. It agreed that failure to fire the Wallaceite might have cost the president of the college his job and the college itself much financial support.

Such dangers attend all our freedoms. It is only in opposing them, as great Universities like Harvard consistently have done, that true academic freedom can be preserved.

The cynic may say that Harvard, with its great wealth, can afford to be free. But the realist will remind him that once-tiny Harvard achieved both its wealth and its great rank by a devotion to the very ideals of American freedom that inspired not merely those who taught and studied there but millions of free men beyond its walls.

If it is true that Evansville can afford only second-class citizenship for its professors, if it must invoke the censorship of conformity against the inquiring mind, it is a poverty-stricken city indeed.

It is a poverty endangering to us all, and far more costly than a few donations withheld from a building program or an endowment fund, for if today it victimizes one brand of dissent, tomorrow it can victimize any and all.

¹ This reference is to the Committee's recommendation (not "resolution") of censure of the Administration of the College.—THE EDITORS

REPORT OF THE 1949 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The 1949 Nominating Committee of the American Association of University Professors herewith submits its nominations for the offices of President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, and for ten members of the Council of the Association, two from each of the ten electoral districts, designed to assure geographical distribution of the Council membership. The consensus of the Committee on these nominations was reached in a meeting of the Committee on July 16, 1949, at the Association's Central Office in Washington, D. C., and by a subsequent exchange of memoranda.

In performing its task, the Committee was guided by the provision of By-Law 1 of the Association's Constitution to give "due regard to fields of professional interests, types of institutions, and suggestions received from the membership." The Committee had before it many suggestions, from individual members and from Chapters, of persons to be considered for nomination. These suggestions had been tabulated and classified by the staff of the Association's Central Office and made available to the Committee well in advance of its meeting. Also available to the Committee at this meeting was pertinent information in the files of the Association's Central Office concerning members under consideration for nomination.

The membership will note that the Committee is submitting a single nominee for each of the offices of the Association—the Presidency, the First Vice-Presidency, and the Second Vice-Presidency. In selecting but a single nominee for each of these offices, the Committee acted pursuant to the practice of the Association that has been followed throughout its history. Periodically this practice has been reviewed by the Committee on Organization and Policy and by the Council of the Association, and in each case the practice has been reaffirmed. The reason for the practice is found in the arduousness of the duties of Association offices, particularly the Presidency, which deters many able men and women from

accepting nomination for these offices. The practice of selecting a single nominee for each of these offices is conducive to the acceptance of such nominations by members of the profession of the caliber desired. To a degree this consideration is pertinent also in connection with the nomination for membership on the Association's Council but not to the same degree because the duties of a Council member, in comparison with those of the Association's President, are light. It should be pointed out, however, that in many cases a considerable amount of persuasion is necessary to induce well-qualified men and women to accept nomination for the Association's Council. In this connection the Committee wishes to emphasize a point that has been stated by previous Nominating Committees, namely, that nominees for the Association's Council are not to be regarded as candidates in the sense that they are seeking election. Acceptance of nomination is a service to the Association and should be so regarded by the membership.

In submitting this slate of nominees, the Committee wishes to direct attention to the provision in By-Law 1 of the Association's Constitution for making nominations by petition, both for Association offices and for membership on the Association's Council. The text of this By-Law may be found on pages 117-120 in the current Spring (1949) issue of the Association's *Bulletin*.

The nominees submitted in this Report and other nominations that may be made by petition will be voted upon in the Annual Election of the Association which will be conducted by mail ballot as an extension of the Annual Meeting. Early in January, 1950, individual ballots will be sent to the Active Members of the Association. The results of the election will be announced at the last session of the Annual Meeting which is scheduled to be held on March 25-26, 1950. It is the judgment of the Committee that the nominees presented in this Report assure the Active Members of the Association the opportunity of voting for well-qualified members for Association offices and for Council membership.

FREDERICK S. DEIBLER (Economics), Emeritus, Northwestern University, *Chairman*

DONALD W. DAVIS (Biology), College of William and Mary
CLAIR F. LITTELL (History and Political Science), Cornell College

PRESIDENT

RICHARD HARRISON SHRYOCK, History, Johns Hopkins University

Elected 1926.¹ Chap. Pres., 1933-34, Duke University; Chap. Pres., 1942-43, University of Pennsylvania; Committee Q on Preparation and Qualification of Teachers, 1932-36; Committee F on Admission of Members, 1940-; Nominating Committee, 1939, Chm., 1940; Council, 1944-46.

Born 1893. B.S., 1917, Ph.D., 1924, University of Pennsylvania. Teacher, 1913-16, Philadelphia Public Schools; Instructor, 1921-24, Ohio State University; Instructor, 1924-25, University of Pennsylvania; Associate Professor and Professor, 1925-38, Duke University; Fellowship Secretary, 1935-36, Social Science Research Council; Professor, 1938-49, University of Pennsylvania; Acting Director, 1946-47, American Council of Learned Societies; Director, Institute of Medical History, 1949-; Johns Hopkins University.

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

RALPH F. FUCHS, Law, Indiana University

Elected 1931. Chap. Pres., 1933-34, Washington University; Chap. Vice-Pres., 1949-50, Indiana University; Council, 1945-47.

Born 1899. A.B., LL.B., 1922, Washington University; Ph.D., 1925, Robert Brookings Graduate School; J.S.D., 1935, Yale University. Assistant Professor, 1927-30, Associate Professor, 1930-35, Professor, 1935-45, Washington University; Professor, 1945-; Indiana University.

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

HELEN C. WHITE, English, University of Wisconsin

Elected 1927.

Born 1896. A.B., 1916, A.M., 1917, Radcliffe College; Ph.D., 1924, University of Wisconsin. Assistant, 1917-19, Smith College; Instructor, 1919-25, Assistant Professor, 1925-33, Associate Professor, 1933-36, Professor, 1936-; University of Wisconsin; Visiting Professor, 1943-44, Barnard College.

Nominees for the Council, 1950-52²

DISTRICT I

ROYAL M. FRYE, Physics, Boston University

Elected 1939. Chap. Pres., 1948-.

Born 1890. A.B., 1911, A.M., 1912, Ph.D., 1934, Boston University; attended Harvard University, 1912-13, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1926-27, 1942-43. Assistant, 1909-12, Instructor, 1913-16, Boston University;

¹ Refers in this and each following statement to the date of election to Association membership.

² Ten members to be elected, one from each of the geographical districts.

Instructor, 1915-31, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Instructor, 1930-46, Chairman of Department, 1940-46, Lincoln Technical Institute; Instructor, 1926-27, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Instructor, 1931-36, Assistant Professor, 1936-42, Professor and Chairman of Department, 1942- , Boston University.

S. JUSTUS MCKINLEY, History, Springfield College

Elected 1948. Chap. Pres., 1948-49.

Born 1900. A.B., 1926, Franklin and Marshall College; A.M., 1927, Ph.D., 1931, Harvard University. Instructor, 1933-41, Dean of Freshmen, 1941-46, Chairman of Faculty, 1944-45, Acting President, 1945, Emerson College; Professor and Chairman of Social Sciences Staff, 1946- , Springfield College.

DISTRICT II

MARJORIE DILLEY, Political Science, Connecticut College

Elected 1935. Chap. Secy., 1938-41; Chap. Pres., 1947-49.

Born 1903. A.B., 1923, University of Colorado; M.A., 1929, Ph.D., 1934, University of Washington; attended London School of Economics, 1932. Assistant Professor, 1930-32, College of Puget Sound; Instructor, 1935-37, Assistant Professor, 1937-41, Associate Professor, 1941-47, Professor 1947- , Chairman of Department, 1946- , Connecticut College.

M. A. JOHNSON, Botany, Rutgers University

Elected 1931. Chap. Pres., 1947-48.

Born 1901. B.S., 1924, Penn College; M.S., 1926, Ph.D., 1928, University of Chicago. Principal, 1924-25, high school (Iowa); Instructor, 1926-27, Syracuse University; Acting Associate Professor, 1928-29, Indiana State Teachers College; Assistant Professor, 1929-42, Associate Professor, 1942-47, Professor, 1947- , Chairman of Department, 1945- , Rutgers University.

DISTRICT III

WILLIAM EDWARD BROWN, Greek and Ancient History, Lafayette College

Elected 1932. Chap. Secy., 1947- .

Born 1904. A.B., 1925, A.M., 1926, Syracuse University; Ph.D., 1941, Yale University. Instructor, 1926-27, Syracuse University; Instructor, Assistant Professor and Associate Professor, 1927-42, Professor, 1946- , Head of Department of Languages, 1947- , Director of Veterans Affairs, 1946-47, Lafayette College.

CARL HARTZELL, French, Franklin and Marshall College

Elected 1934. Chap. Secy., 1945-48.

Born 1890. Ph.B., 1913, Dickinson College; Diploma de Hautes Etudes, 1926, University of Grenoble; A.M., 1933, University of Pennsylvania. Instructor, 1919, University of Maine; Instructor, 1919-21, Pennsylvania State College;

Instructor, 1926-27, University of Pennsylvania; Instructor, 1929-35, Assistant Professor, 1935-44, Associate Professor, 1944-49, Professor, 1949- , Franklin and Marshall College.

DISTRICT IV

BOYD HARSHBARGER, Applied and Mathematical Statistics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Elected 1946. Chap. Pres., 1947-48; Chap. Council, 1948-49.

Born 1906. B.A., 1928, Bridgewater College; M.S., 1931, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; M.A., 1935, University of Illinois; Ph.D., 1943, George Washington University. Instructor, 1929-30, Miller School; Instructor and Assistant Professor, 1931-39, Professor, 1942-48, Director of Statistical Laboratory, 1948- , Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD, European History, Sweet Briar College

Elected 1936. Chap. Secy., 1948-49.

Born 1894. A.B., 1916; M.A., 1922; Ph.D., 1923, Radcliffe College. Teacher, secondary schools, 1916-21, 1924-25; Instructor, 1925-27, Assistant Professor, 1927-37, Western Reserve University; Assistant Professor, 1937-42, Associate Professor, 1942- , Sweet Briar College.

DISTRICT V

ERNEST W. GRAY, English, University of Toledo

Elected 1939. Chap. Pres., 1946-47, College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division); Chap. Vice-Pres., 1949- , University of Toledo.

Born 1902. Ph.B., 1924, M.A., 1926, Brown University; Ph.D., 1931, Harvard University. Instructor, 1925-28, Brown University; Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, 1931-42, 1946-47, Chairman of Faculty, 1942-46, College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division); Professor, 1947- , Acting Chairman of Department, 1949- , University of Toledo.

WARREN TAYLOR, English, Oberlin College

Elected 1936. Chap. Secy., 1944-45; Chap. Pres., 1945-47.

Born 1903. A.B., 1924, A.M., 1926, Vanderbilt University; Ph.D., 1937, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1926-29, University of Tennessee; Graduate Student and Instructor, 1934-37, University of Chicago; Instructor, 1930-34, 1937-41, Assistant Professor, 1941-47, Associate Professor, 1947- , Oberlin College.

DISTRICT VI

JAMES W. FESLER, Political Science, University of North Carolina

Elected 1935. Chap. Secy., 1946-47, Chap. Pres., 1948, Chap. Executive Committee, 1949- .

Born 1911. A.B., 1932, University of Minnesota; M.A., 1933, Ph.D., 1935,

Harvard University. Assistant Professor, 1935-37, Associate Professor, 1937-45, Professor, 1947- , University of North Carolina; Research Fellow, 1934-35, The Brookings Institution; 1937-38, The Rockefeller Foundation; Visiting Professor, 1949-50, University of California.

J. WESLEY HOFFMANN, History, University of Tennessee

Elected 1930. Chap. Secy., 1933-34, Morningside College; Chap. Pres., 1939-40, University of Tennessee.

Born 1895. B.A., 1918, University of Minnesota; M.A., 1922, Ph.D., 1937, University of Chicago; studied, 1926-27, Universities of Berlin and Bonn. Professor 1919-20, John Fletcher College; Assistant Professor, 1922-24, Professor and Head of Department, 1928-34, Morningside College; Instructor, 1925-26, State University of Iowa; Instructor, 1927-28, University of Chicago; Assistant Professor, 1934-37, Montana State College; Professor, 1937- , Head of Department, 1944- , University of Tennessee.

DISTRICT VII

WARREN C. MIDDLETON, Psychology, DePauw University

Elected 1930. Chap. Pres., 1947-48; Chairman, 1948, Indiana State Meeting of Association.

Born 1901. A.B., 1923, Central College (Missouri); A.M., 1924, Vanderbilt University, Ph.D., 1929, Yale University. Assistant Professor, 1928-31, Associate Professor, 1931-40, Professor, 1940- , DePauw University.

JAMES HEDLEY PEELING, Sociology, Butler University

Elected 1933. Chap. Pres., 1937-38; 1947-48.

Born 1896. A.B., 1920, A.M., 1923, Gettysburg College; Ph.D., 1929, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1920-24, Storm King Boys' School; Instructor, 1927-28, University of Chicago High School; University Fellow (History), 1926-28, University of Chicago; Chairman of Department (Social Science), 1928-30, Teachers College of Indianapolis; Associate Professor (Social Science), 1930-33; Associate Professor (Sociology), 1933-43, Professor, 1943- , Head of Department, 1946- , Butler University.

DISTRICT VIII

W. E. ALLEY, Economics, Drake University

Elected 1938. Chap. Secy., 1943-44.

Born 1903. A.B., 1926, DePauw University; M.A., 1932, Ph.D., 1941, University of Illinois. Teacher, 1926-28, High School, McLeansboro, Illinois; Teacher, 1928-31, Principal, 1929-31, High School, Burney, Indiana; Teacher, 1931-36, High School, Urbana, Illinois; Instructor, 1936-42, Grove City College; Assistant Professor, 1942-44, Associate Professor, 1944-47, Acting Dean, 1944-45, Professor and Head of Department, 1947- , Drake University.

U. S. MAXWELL, Chemistry, Lincoln University

Elected 1935. Chap. Secy., 1936-40, 1945-46, 1949- ; Chap. Pres., 1941, 1948.

Born 1896. A.B., 1921, Ph.D., 1943, University of Colorado; M.S., 1928, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1921-25, Philander Smith College; Instructor, 1926-27, Fisk University; Professor, 1928-29, Arkansas State College; Professor and Head of Department, 1929 - , Director of Summer Session, 1946- , Lincoln University.

DISTRICT IX**J. FAGG FOSTER, Economics, University of Denver**

Elected 1943. Chap. Pres., 1949-50.

Born 1907. B.S., 1936, East Texas State Teachers College; M.A., 1938, Ph.D., 1946, University of Texas. Instructor, 1941-42, University of Texas; Assistant Professor, 1942-43, Kenyon College; Lecturer, 1943-44, Western Reserve University; Professor, 1946- , University of Denver.

WILLIS D. JACOBS, English Literature, University of New Mexico

Elected 1939. Chap. Pres., 1947-49; Chairman, 1948, New Mexico Conference of Association.

Born 1914. B.A., 1936, M.A., 1937, University of New Mexico; Ph.D., 1945, University of North Carolina. Instructor, 1937-45, Assistant Professor, 1946-48, Associate Professor, 1949- , University of New Mexico.

DISTRICT X**WALTER P. COTTAM, Botany, University of Utah**

Elected 1937. Chap. Pres., 1940-41.

Born 1894. A.B., 1916, M.A., 1918, Brigham Young University; Ph.D., 1926, University of Chicago. Assistant Professor, 1919-26, Professor, 1926-31, Brigham Young University; Associate Professor, 1931-36, Professor, 1936- , Head of Department, 1948- , University of Utah; Botanist, 1946, Shrivenham American University, England.

LLOYD B. WILLIAMS, Mathematics, Reed College

Elected 1943. Chap. Secy., 1945-46, Hamilton College; Chap. Secy., 1948-49, Reed College.

Born 1913. B.A., 1935, Reed College; S.M., 1939, University of Chicago. Instructor, 1940-42, Georgia Institute of Technology; Instructor, 1942-43, Assistant Professor, 1943-46, Hamilton College; Assistant Professor, 1947-49, Associate Professor, 1949- , Reed College.

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Library Association (with adaptations for librarians), the American Political Science Association, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.¹

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations.

West Chester State Teachers College	December, 1939
West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	
Adelphi College, Garden City, New York	December, 1941
(October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri	December, 1941
(October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	
State Teachers College, ² Murfreesboro, Tennessee	May, 1943
(December, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-677)	
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina	May, 1943
(April, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-176)	
University of Missouri, Columbia and Rolla, Missouri	June, 1946
(Summer, 1945 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 278-315)	
University of Texas, Austin, Texas	June, 1946
(Winter, 1944 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 627-634; Autumn, 1945 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 462-465; Summer, 1946 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 374-385)	

¹ Reorganized in 1948 as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

² Now Middle Tennessee State College.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
of
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

What It Is - - What It Does

The American Association of University Professors is the professional organization for college and university teachers and investigators in the United States and its territories, in Canada, and in American controlled institutions of higher education abroad. For the academic profession its rôle and functions are analogous to those of the American Bar Association for the legal profession and the American Medical Association for the profession of medicine. It grew out of a conference of representatives of universities called by the Faculty of The Johns Hopkins University in 1913. The organizational meeting was held in New York City on January 1 and 2, 1915. The nature and purposes of the Association are indicated in the following statement of objectives formulated on that occasion:

To bring about more effective cooperation among the members of the profession in the discharge of their special responsibilities as custodians of the interests of higher education and research in America; to promote a more general and methodical discussion of problems relating to education in institutions of higher learning; to create means for the authoritative expression of the public opinion of the body of college and university teachers; to make collective action possible, and in general to maintain and advance the ideals and standards of the profession.

Throughout its history the Association has sought to develop and strengthen the professional concept among college and university teachers to the end that these objectives might be attained. Through its central office, its several committees and its Council,

the Association serves as a clearing house for the consideration of policies and problems of the profession.

Committees

The Association maintains committees on the following professional subjects: Academic Freedom and Tenure, Author-Publisher Contracts, Cooperation with Latin-American Universities, Economic Welfare of the Profession, Educational Standards, Encouragement of University Research, International Relations, Library Service, Pensions and Insurance, Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government, Preparation and Qualification of Teachers, Professional Ethics, Relation of Junior Colleges to Higher Education.

The Association also maintains organizational committees on: Admission of Members, Financial Resources of the Association, Organization and Conduct of Chapters, Organization and Policy.

Academic Freedom and Tenure

Independently and in cooperation with other educational organizations, the Association has sought the formulation, the recognition, and the observance of principles, practices, and procedures conducive to freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression. The most recent enunciation of these principles and procedures is set forth in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. These principles have the endorsement of the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Political Science Association, the American Library Association (an adaptation for librarians), and the American Association of University Professors.

Through its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Association has conducted many investigations of alleged violations of the principles of academic freedom and tenure and in certain instances has published reports in the *Bulletin*. There is abundant evidence that this work of the Association has been effective in stabilizing tenure in our institutions of higher education, thereby furthering academic freedom which cannot exist without the economic security provided by continuity of tenure.

Annual Meeting

The Constitution of the Association provides for an Annual Meeting of the membership. Prior to 1947 the Annual Meeting of the Association was held in connection with a meeting or meetings of subject matter organizations, *viz.*; American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, Association of American Law Schools, and the Modern Language Association of America. Beginning with 1947 the Annual Meeting has been an independent meeting and has been held in late February in a different geographical area each year—in 1947, Boston, Massachusetts; in 1948, St. Louis, Missouri; in 1949, Washington, D. C.

Sessions of the Annual Meeting usually extend through two days, preceded and followed by sessions of the Association's Council. The programs consist of addresses, reports of committees, symposia, and forum discussions on subjects of concern to all college and university teachers and to all others who are interested in higher education.

Bulletin

The Association publishes a quarterly journal, the *Bulletin*, which is sent to all members. The *Bulletin* is an educational journal, presenting articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in, or are a part of, our institutions of higher education. It has an increasing nonmembership circulation, particularly among college and university administrative officers and trustees, and is contributing greatly toward a wider recognition of the "professional" concept of teaching and research and the "associates" concept of the Faculty-Administration relationship. The subscription price of the *Bulletin* for nonmembers in the United States is \$3.00 a year. Foreign subscriptions for nonmembers, including those in Canada, are \$3.50 a year. Single copies are available for purchase. In all cases the postage is prepaid.

Studies

The Association has from time to time formulated policies and conducted special studies, as indicated in the following citations:

Academic Freedom and Tenure.

- Declaration of Principles, *Bulletin*, December, 1915 (reprinted, Spring, 1948).
- Statements of Principles: 1925 Conference Statement and 1940 Statement, *Bulletin*, Spring, 1949.
- Annual Reports. Current Spring *Bulletin*.
- Conditions of Tenure. *Bulletin*, April, 1932.
- Freedom of Teaching in Science. *Bulletin*, February, 1925; December, 1927.
- College and University Teaching. *Bulletin*, May, 1933, 122 pp.
- Depression, Recovery and Higher Education. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1937, 543 pp.
- Employment of Graduate Student Assistants and its Effect on Quality of Undergraduate Instruction and on Graduate Work of the Student Assistants. *Bulletin*, February-March, 1926.
- Faculty Salaries and Salary Schedules in Selected Institutions. *Bulletin*, Winter, 1948.
- Federal Income Tax Returns. Published annually in Winter *Bulletin*.
- Honorary Degrees and the Basis for Conferring Them. *Bulletin*, December, 1917.
- Methods of Appointment and Promotion. *Bulletin*, March, 1929.
- Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates. *Bulletin*, February, October, 1922; October, December, 1923; May, October, November, December, 1924; November, 1925; February-March, April, October, 1926.
- Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students. *Bulletin*, October, 1921.
- Normal Amount of Teaching and Research for Professors. *Bulletin*, March, 1930; March, 1931.
- Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government. *Bulletin*, March, 1920 (reprinted in May, 1924); March, 1936; March, 1937; February, 1938; April, 1939; April, 1940; April, 1941; Spring, 1948.
- Relation of Vocational to General Higher Education. *Bulletin*, November, 1925.
- Required Courses in Education. *Bulletin*, May, 1930; March, 1933.
- Requirements for the Master of Arts Degree. *Bulletin*, February, 1931; March, 1932.
- Requirements for the Ph.D. Degree. *Bulletin*, January-February, 1919.
- Status of Women in College and University Faculties. *Bulletin*, October, 1921; November, 1924.
- Summer School Organization. *Bulletin*, March, 1919.
- Systems for Sabbatical Years. *Bulletin*, March, 1931.

Chapters

Whenever the Active Members at any eligible institution number seven or more, they may organize a chapter. Upon the election of a seventh Active Member, one or more members may call an organizational meeting.

The principal functions of chapters are: (1) to consider questions of concern to college and university teachers; (2) to consider current local questions of educational policy or method; (3) to act as an initiating agency for faculty action; (4) to take action upon specific matters of Association business submitted to the chapters by the Association's Council or its central office; (5) to cooperate with the Council and central office of the Association in dealing with problems of the profession.

The standing Committee on Organization and Conduct of Chapters, with membership on a geographical basis from sixteen regions, maintains relations with chapter officers and arranges for occasional regional meetings in which a number of chapters may participate.

At present the Association has 384 organized Chapters.

Growth

The Association has had a gradual and encouraging growth. Beginning with 1362 charter members, the membership has increased as follows:

January 1, 1920.....	2,388
January 1, 1925.....	5,591
January 1, 1930.....	7,986
January 1, 1935.....	11,500
January 1, 1940.....	15,330
January 1, 1945.....	17,970
January 1, 1947.....	21,238
January 1, 1949.....	33,638

The membership is distributed in 792 accredited colleges and universities and represents approximately one-third of all eligible college and university teachers.

MEMBERSHIP

CLASSES AND CONDITIONS—NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

Active. A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Junior. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Associate. Associate membership is not an elective member-

ship. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Emeritus. Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

Continuing Eligibility. Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

Interruption or Termination of Membership. Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year, during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

Nominations for Membership

The following 660 nominations for Active membership and 9 nominations for Junior membership are published as provided in the Constitution of the Association. Protests of nominations may be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association who will, in turn, transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee on Admission of Members questions concerning the technical eligibility of nominees for membership as provided in the Constitution of the Association. To be considered, such protests must be filed with the General Secretary within thirty days after this publication.

Active

Adelphi College, Paul Frisch, John P. McGuire, Nora L. Magid, Arnold Messner, Arvilla Nolan, Flora R. Schreiber; **Agnes Scott College**, M. Kathryn Glick; **University of Akron**, Georg G. Iggers; **Alabama College**, Willilee R. Trumbauer; **Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville)**, Maggie Coghill, C. Perry Martin, Georgia C. Victor; **University of Alabama**, Sam E. Hobbs, Venice Poulos; **Albion College**, Earl M. Aris, Jacqueline Maag, Howard E. Pettersen; **American University**, Hugo Schulze; **Amherst College**, Hollis W. Huston; **Arkansas State College**, Mary R. Brown, Clarissa Delano, Jean R. Williams; **University of Arkansas**, Raymond H. Burros; **University of Arkan-**

sas (Medical School), Carl E. Duffy, Morris Dumoff, Alan C. Pipkin, Lloyd D. Seager; **Atlanta University**, Paul I. Clifford, Isaiah J. Domas, Esther Milner; **Atlantic Union College**, Theodore DeLuca; **Augustana College and Theological Seminary**, Helena Bryson, Zilpha Colee.

Baker University, Deane Postlethwaite; **Ball State Teachers College**, John E. Baker, William H. Cates; **Bard College**, Irving Lazar, James B. Schroyer, Charles J. Tremblay; **Bates College**, Oliver Andrews, Jr.; **Baylor University**, Isabelle Hunt, William L. Williamson; **Blackburn College**, Marion E. Carlson, Patricia Evans, John V. G. Forbes, Barry M. Freeman, Sarah L. Hawes, Mary M. Hursey, William Kreuger, Hung-chun Kung, Harold S. Lowe, Harold E. Spencer, Catherine Wetteroth; **Bluefield State College**, James E. Andrews, John R. Rankin; **Boston University**, John G. Read, Dorothy Speare; **Bowdoin College**, Robert H. Ivy, Jr.; **Bradley University**, Alexander Baird, Harold P. Lucy; **University of British Columbia**, W. Leonard Grant, Alexander Maslow; **Brooklyn College**, James Bakst; **Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn**, Ernest I. Becker, Charles R. Hough; **Brownsville Junior College**, Leslie H. Bonham.

California State Polytechnic College, A. Norman Cruikshanks; **University of California**, Charles S. Muscatine, Edward H. Schafer; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, David G. Ryans; **University of California (Santa Barbara College)**, Richard Kaywood; **Carroll College**, Tom Stine; **Central College (Arkansas)**, Mrs. Leslie W. Buchanan, Thomas L. Hicks, Marvin L. Stone; **Chapman College**, Kurt Bergel, Edmund R. Harrington; **University of Chicago**, Garth J. Thomas; **Chico State College**, Howard C. Benedict, Arnold E. Needham, Charles C. Scott; **University of Cincinnati**, C. Leslie Martin, Wayne S. Overmyer, Samuel Rapoport, Florence Silverstein; **The City College (New York)**, Paul J. Burke; **Claremont Men's College**, William C. Ide; **Clemson Agricultural College**, Charles E. Kirkwood, Jr.; **College of Education and Industrial Arts**, Dean S. Yarbrough; **Colorado College**, Edwin C. Broome, Jr., Kenneth D. Carroll, William A. Fischer, Richard M. Fox, Hal E. Hagen, Elisabeth B. MacDougall, Gregory J. MacDougall, Audra Dea Marshall, H. Richard Van Saun; **Western State College of Colorado**, Gerald P. Benson, Francis L. Celauro, Emanuel Gonick, E. Martin Hatcher; **University of Colorado**, Robert W. Albright; **Columbia University**, Theodore W. Anderson, Jr., George R. Collins, Donald M. Frame, Howard Levene, Frank W. Schiff, William O. Trapp; **Connecticut College**, Mary T. Reynolds; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, Seward E. Beacom, Francis J. Rio; **University of Connecticut**, Horace J. Fuller; **Cornell University**, Robert C. Clark, Jr., Lloyd H. Elliott, Yung-Huai Kuo, Robert E. McGarrah.

Davidson College, James S. Purcell, Jr.; **Davis and Elkins College**, Thomas R. Ross; **Delaware State College**, Theodore R. Moses; **Denison University**, Robert S. Carter; **University of Denver**, Robert L. Blair, Whitney T. Perkins; **De Paul University**, John R. Cortelyou, Mary A. McWhinnie, Howard Sloan; **University of Detroit**, Michael Albery; **Dominican College of San Rafael**,

Edward P. Mumford; **Drake University**, Willard J. Brandt, Doyle Mikesell; **Duke University**, Helen Nahm, Henry S. Roberts, Jr.

Earlham College, Thomas S. Brown, Frederick A. Grohsmeyer, David E. Henley, Millard S. Markle, Merle A. Rousey, Wendell W. Williams; **Elmhurst College**, Ellen D. Bieler, Philip Durham, Tekla Story; **Emory University**, Willis A. Sutton, Jr.; **Everett Junior College**, Marion Bland, Clifford E. Higer, Isabelle A. Kaiser, Charlotte E. Miller, Margaret E. Svec.

Fairleigh Dickinson College, Eugene H. Ehrlich; **Fairmont State College**, Spaulding Rogers; **Fenn College**, Glenn H. Shakley; **Fisk University**, Dwight H. Wilson; **Florida Southern College**, Robert G. Richards; **Florida State University**, John O. Boynton, Jack W. Eichinger, Jr., Charles W. Frothingham, Laura M. Henry, Mary E. Thomas, S. Elizabeth Thomson, Ralph L. Witherspoon, Thomas G. Wright, Arthur W. Ziegler; **University of Florida**, John A. Harrison, Permillas A. Lee, Jr.; **Fresno State College**, Lloyd Dowler.

George Washington University, Solomon Katzenelbogen; **Georgetown University**, Theodore Sourkes; **North Georgia College**, Benedict R. DeAngelo; **Georgia Institute of Technology**, Samuel C. Ketchin; **University of Georgia**, Clarence J. Smith, Jr., Howard R. Smith, Irwin V. Sperry, Jack Wilson; **Goucher College**, Annelies A. Rose; **Guilford College**, Edward F. Burrows; **Gustavus Adolphus College**, Paul Steen.

Hamline University, Clarence A. Nelson; **Hampton Institute**, Helen B. Goetsch; **Harvard University**, John O. McCormick; **Hofstra College**, Edward M. Anson, David L. Dykstra, Leonard D. Goodstein, Robert W. Harrison, Albert J. Lombardo, Florence Mindell; **Howard University**, David Blackwell, Paul F. Lawrence, Mark H. Watkins.

Northern Idaho College of Education, Benjamin R. Goodhead, Francis D. Haines, Arley F. Rost; **Eastern Illinois State College**, Earl W. Boyd, Arthur F. Byrnes, Clifford L. Fagan, Guss L. Grimm, Ethel I. Hanson, Ruby M. Harris, Arvilla Knuth, Isabelle McClung, Ica Marks, Gordon M. Martin, Otho J. Quick, Harold J. Retallick, Robert C. Ryle, Louis G. Schmidt, Esther Silverstein, Catherine A. Smith; **Western Illinois State College**, R. Bruce Harley, Georgia M. Shideler; **Southern Illinois University**, Phillip H. Olsson, Caroline Raut; **University of Illinois**, Richard G. Brill, John J. DeBoer, Barnard Hewitt, Arthur M. McAnally, Dallas W. Smythe, Marvin Stippes, Emanuel T. Weiler; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Irwin K. Feinstein, Henry L. Mikolajczyk; **Illinois Wesleyan University**, Robert O. Gibbon, George H. Orwig, John A. Pettit, Samuel C. Ratcliffe; **Indiana University**, Howard T. Batchelder, Bernard L. Weddel, Fred Witney; **Iowa State College**, G. L. Bridger, Frederick R. Duke, Ralph L. Freeman, L. Sigfred Linderoth, Jr.; **Iowa State Teachers College**, Ellen Aakrik, Hulda Ahlschwede, Ruth A. Allen, Joseph A. Bolinsky, E. Jean Bontz, Irving H. Brune, Jack W. Burgner, Richard L. Crossman, William L. J. Dee, Miles H. Esget, Mary Green, Peter G. Haines, Elbert W. Hamilton, Mary W. Hanawalt, Clifford H. Herrold, Katherine Humphrey, Oliver P. Kolstoe, Edward Kurtz, Charles T. Leavitt, Fred W. Lott, Jr., Walter A. Lucas, Lauretta G. McCusker, Peter M. Mazula, Vernon N. Mork,

Gilbert W. Mouser, Selma E. Nelson, Francis S. Phraner, Farnham G. Pope, John B. Powell, Dorothy L. Price, Harold Rice, Donald H. Rollstin, George W. Samson, Pauline L. Sauer, Raymond J. Schlicher, Marshall Schools, Lorraine Schueller, Rhoda H. Stratton, Adeline Torgrimson, Dorothy E. Wineke, Nina M. Yeager, Dorothy Yennie; **Iowa Wesleyan College**, William H. Herrmann.

John Carroll University, John Molnar; **Juniata College**, Mildred A. Tausch.

Kansas State College, Golda M. Crawford, Fred A. Kummerow, Edith M. Ridgeway, Robert G. Stanley, Thomas B. Steunenberg; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Darrell E. Wood; **University of Kansas**, Leola S. Horowitz, Charles W. Laughton, Jr., Alton Thomas; **University of Kansas City**, Evaline M. Hartley; **University of Kentucky**, Maurice A. Clay, Gordon R. Leader, James M. Schreyer, William F. Wagner; **Keuka College**, Rita I. Hunter, Quentin T. Lightner, Rita S. Woodford; **Keystone Junior College**, Alexander H. Anderson, Jr., Hubert Vecchierello; **Kirkville College of Osteopathy and Surgery**, Neil Johnstone.

Lake Forest College, Doris L. Borrusch, J. Edward Dirks; **Lamar College**, Charles H. Wilbanks; **Langston University**, Julius H. Hughes, Samuel P. Massie; **LaSalle College**, Joseph G. Grassi, Richard T. Hoar, John J. Rooney; **Lincoln Memorial University**, Klaus Speer; **Lindenwood College**, Dorothy Ely, Donn W. Hayes, Martha Reese; **Louisiana College**, Annie L. Brackett, Ivey Gravette; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Maurice P. Dossey, Howard Turner; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, John Piscopo; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Dennis P. Noah; **Loyola University (Louisiana)**, James Kalshoven; **Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary**, John B. Moose; **Lynchburg College**, Hughes L. Buerger, Jr.

University of Maine, Kenneth W. Davidson, Paul W. Howells, Lyle C. Jenness, Winthrop C. Libby, Irving H. Prageman, Benjamin R. Speicher, James M. Whitten; **University of Manitoba**, George L. Brodersen, Nathan S. Mendelsohn, William L. Morton, Harry Steinhauer; **Marietta College**, Dan F. Baker, Leslie E. Blough, Wen-Yu Cheng, Nelson V. Davis, Harold L. Dean, Paul R. Gawthrop, John E. Sandt, Bernard B. Schlanger, L. Blaine Tewksbury, Jr., David Zesmer; **Maryland State Teachers College (Frostburg)**, Frederick Pistor; **University of Maryland**, John A. Daiker, Harry J. Romm; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Framingham)**, Ada M. Shawkey; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Worcester)**, Marguerite C. McKelligett; **University of Massachusetts**, Walter S. Eisenmenger; **Mercer University**, D. Kelley Barnett; **University of Miami**, James A. Jarvis; **Northwestern Michigan College of Education**, Roy M. McCollom, Calvin E. Schorer; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Donald M. Martin; **Michigan College of Mining and Technology**, Louis S. Drake, Dalton E. McFarland, Carl R. Moss; **University of Michigan**, Richard K. Beardsley, Emerson F. Greenman; **Miles College**, Myrtle W. Blissett; **Mills College**, H. Orville Nordberg; **Millsaps College**, Jack E. Prince, Walter L. Withers; **University of Minnesota**, James R. Beer, Laurence K. Cutkomp, John E. Dobbin, Ethel R. Gorham,

Marshall C. Hervey, Gotthilf Jorgensen, Thomas H. King, Warren G. Meyer, Samuel H. Monk, Howard A. Morris, Truman R. Nodland, Joseph C. Olson, Jr., Marietta Pérez, Milo J. Peterson, Minard W. Stout, David W. Thompson; **Mississippi State College**, William P. Carter, Clyde H. Farnsworth, Malcolm G. Gray, Thomas A. Kelly, Roy A. Klages, Oscar H. Little, William W. Littlejohn, Howard Nicely, Dale J. Richey, Dorris W. Rivers, Edwin S. Sanders, Thurston Walls, Louise Whitlow, Lois Williams, Ben M. Wofford; **Mississippi State College for Women**, Joseph B. James, James E. Poindexter; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Alvin C. Steinbach; **Southeast Missouri State College**, Walter Roth, Wayne L. Thurman; **Southwest Missouri State College**, Vivian M. Ford; **Northwest Missouri State Teachers College**, Anne Arnold, Mabel Cook, Jessie B. Jutten, Paul T. McNutt, Effie Mae Morrey; **University of Missouri**, Albert Brent, Paul Y. Burns; **Montana State University**, John A. Chapman; **Montgomery Junior College**, George S. Morrison, Roi M. White, Stephen G. Wright; **Morningside College**, Mary Bowne; **Muhlenberg College**, William C. Wilbur, Jr., **Mundelein College**, Sally W. Cassidy.

National College of Education, Mary-Louise Neumann; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, Phyllis Campbell, N. Richard Diffenderfer, Robert W. House, Clara A. Johnson, Minnie E. Larson, Glo Rose Mitchell, Helen Sampson, Malvina S. Stoutemyer, Reuben R. Wagner; **University of Nebraska**, Max M. Whittaker, John Wiley; **Eastern New Mexico University**, Amos H. Lytton; **New Mexico State College**, Sanford C. Gladden, Wanda Tilden; **University of New Mexico**, Gertrude Richards; **New York University**, Carl E. Gregory, Walter W. Haines, Hazel Haskett, Harold G. Lorsch, Stanley F. Pechar, Charles Seligson; **Newberry College**, Annie Lee Whitaker; **Niagara University**, John L. Storm; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Vivian W. Henderson; **North Carolina State College**, Stuart Noblin; **University of North Carolina**, Ruth Gilpin, Katharine Jocher, William S. Newman, James S. Patty; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, William R. Barrett; **North Central College**, Edward Schap; **University of North Dakota**, George I. J. Dixon, Lawrence J. Edwards, L. Fernald Foster, Jr., Raymond L. Gorden, Nicholas N. Kohanowski, Gerard M. Mertens, Lyndon R. Musolf, Quentin W. Welty; **Northwestern University**, Daniel C. Boughner, Henry E. Collins, Donald DeFord.

Occidental College, James M. Anderson; **Ohio State University**, William M. MacNevin, William P. Martin, Oskar Seidlin, Dwight L. Smith, Louis E. Vandegrift, William A. Wayt; **University of Omaha**, Laura E. Titzell; **Oregon State College**, W. J. Chamberlin, Oliver Lawrence, Martin J. Ludwig, Bernard Malamud; **University of Oregon**, Bayard H. McConaughy, Rudolph Ottenbacher, John T. Van Bruggen.

Pacific University, Roland N. Adams, Tyler Allhands, Anna Berliner, John W. Berry, Joseph W. Brough, Jr., Richard Eilbott, Homer T. Knight, Ruby M. Peregrine, John J. Wuest; **Pennsylvania College for Women**, Elsie Gulyas; **Pennsylvania State College**, Betty C. Delavan, Elizabeth

Gilbert W. Mouser, Selma E. Nelson, Francis S. Phraner, Farnham G. Pope, John B. Powell, Dorothy L. Price, Harold Rice, Donald H. Rollstin, George W. Samson, Pauline L. Sauer, Raymond J. Schlicher, Marshall Schools, Lorraine Schueller, Rhoda H. Stratton, Adeline Torgrimson, Dorothy E. Wineke, Nina M. Yeager, Dorothy Yennie; **Iowa Wesleyan College**, William H. Herrmann.

John Carroll University, John Molnar; **Juniata College**, Mildred A. Tausch.

Kansas State College, Golda M. Crawford, Fred A. Kummerow, Edith M. Ridgeway, Robert G. Stanley, Thomas B. Steunenberg; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Darrell E. Wood; **University of Kansas**, Leola S. Horowitz, Charles W. Laughton, Jr., Alton Thomas; **University of Kansas City**, Evaline M. Hartley; **University of Kentucky**, Maurice A. Clay, Gordon R. Leader, James M. Schreyer, William F. Wagner; **Keuka College**, Rita I. Hunter, Quentin T. Lightner, Rita S. Woodford; **Keystone Junior College**, Alexander H. Anderson, Jr., Hubert Vecchierello; **Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery**, Neil Johnstone.

Lake Forest College, Doris L. Borrusch, J. Edward Dirks; **Lamar College**, Charles H. Wilbanks; **Langston University**, Julius H. Hughes, Samuel P. Massie; **LaSalle College**, Joseph G. Grassi, Richard T. Hoar, John J. Rooney; **Lincoln Memorial University**, Klaus Speer; **Lindenwood College**, Dorothy Ely, Donn W. Hayes, Martha Reese; **Louisiana College**, Annie L. Brackett, Ivey Gravette; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Maurice P. Dossey, Howard Turner; **Northwestern State College of Louisiana**, John Piscopo; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Dennis P. Noah; **Loyola University (Louisiana)**, James Kalshoven; **Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary**, John B. Moose; **Lynchburg College**, Hughes L. Buerger, Jr.

University of Maine, Kenneth W. Davidson, Paul W. Howells, Lyle C. Jenness, Winthrop C. Libby, Irving H. Prageman, Benjamin R. Speicher, James M. Whitten; **University of Manitoba**, George L. Brodersen, Nathan S. Mendelsohn, William L. Morton, Harry Steinhauer; **Marietta College**, Dan F. Baker, Leslie E. Blough, Wen-Yu Cheng, Nelson V. Davis, Harold L. Dean, Paul R. Gawthrop, John E. Sandt, Bernard B. Schlanger, L. Blaine Tewksbury, Jr., David Zesmer; **Maryland State Teachers College (Frostburg)**, Frederick Pistor; **University of Maryland**, John A. Daiker, Harry J. Romm; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Framingham)**, Ada M. Shawkey; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Worcester)**, Marguerite C. McKelligett; **University of Massachusetts**, Walter S. Eisenmenger; **Mercer University**, D. Kelley Barnett; **University of Miami**, James A. Jarvis; **Northern Michigan College of Education**, Roy M. McCollom, Calvin E. Schorer; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Donald M. Martin; **Michigan College of Mining and Technology**, Louis S. Drake, Dalton E. McFarland, Carl R. Moss; **University of Michigan**, Richard K. Beardsley, Emerson F. Greenman; **Miles College**, Myrtle W. Blissett; **Mills College**, H. Orville Nordberg; **Millsaps College**, Jack E. Prince, Walter L. Withers; **University of Minnesota**, James R. Beer, Laurence K. Cutkomp, John E. Dobbin, Ethel R. Gorham,

Marshall C. Hervey, Gotthilf Jorgensen, Thomas H. King, Warren G. Meyer, Samuel H. Monk, Howard A. Morris, Truman R. Nodland, Joseph C. Olson, Jr., Marietta Pérez, Milo J. Peterson, Minard W. Stout, David W. Thompson; **Mississippi State College**, William P. Carter, Clyde H. Farnsworth, Malcolm G. Gray, Thomas A. Kelly, Roy A. Klages, Oscar H. Little, William W. Littlejohn, Howard Nicely, Dale J. Richey, Dorris W. Rivers, Edwin S. Sanders, Thurston Walls, Louise Whitlow, Lois Williams, Ben M. Wofford; **Mississippi State College for Women**, Joseph B. James, James E. Poindexter; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Alvin C. Steinbach; **Southeast Missouri State College**, Walter Roth, Wayne L. Thurman; **Southwest Missouri State College**, Vivian M. Ford; **Northwest Missouri State Teachers College**, Anne Arnold, Mabel Cook, Jessie B. Jutten, Paul T. McNutt, Effie Mae Morrey; **University of Missouri**, Albert Brent, Paul Y. Burns; **Montana State University**, John A. Chapman; **Montgomery Junior College**, George S. Morrison, Roi M. White, Stephen G. Wright; **Morningside College**, Mary Bowne; **Muhlenberg College**, William C. Wilbur, Jr., **Mundelein College**, Sally W. Cassidy.

National College of Education, Mary-Louise Neumann; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, Phyllis Campbell, N. Richard Diffenderfer, Robert W. House, Clara A. Johnson, Minnie E. Larson, Glo Rose Mitchell, Helen Sampson, Malvina S. Stoutemyer, Reuben R. Wagner; **University of Nebraska**, Max M. Whittaker, John Wiley; **Eastern New Mexico University**, Amos H. Lytton; **New Mexico State College**, Sanford C. Gladden, Wanda Tilden; **University of New Mexico**, Gertrude Richards; **New York University**, Carl E. Gregory, Walter W. Haines, Hazel Haskett, Harold G. Lorsch, Stanley F. Pechar, Charles Seligson; **Newberry College**, Annie Lee Whitaker; **Niagara University**, John L. Storm; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Vivian W. Henderson; **North Carolina State College**, Stuart Noblin; **University of North Carolina**, Ruth Gilpin, Katharine Jocher, William S. Newman, James S. Patty; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, William R. Barrett; **North Central College**, Edward Schap; **University of North Dakota**, George I. J. Dixon, Lawrence J. Edwards, L. Fernald Foster, Jr., Raymond L. Gorden, Nicholas N. Kohanowski, Gerard M. Mertens, Lyndon R. Musolf, Quentin W. Welty; **Northwestern University**, Daniel C. Boughner, Henry E. Collins, Donald DeFord.

Occidental College, James M. Anderson; **Ohio State University**, William M. MacNevin, William P. Martin, Oskar Seidlin, Dwight L. Smith, Louis E. Vandegrift, William A. Wayt; **University of Omaha**, Laura E. Titzell; **Oregon State College**, W. J. Chamberlin, Oliver Lawrence, Martin J. Ludwig, Bernard Malamud; **University of Oregon**, Bayard H. McConaughy, Rudolph Ottenbacher, John T. Van Bruggen.

Pacific University, Roland N. Adams, Tyler Allhands, Anna Berliner, John W. Berry, Joseph W. Brough, Jr., Richard Eilbott, Homer T. Knight, Ruby M. Peregrine, John J. Wuest; **Pennsylvania College for Women**, Elsie Gulyas; **Pennsylvania State College**, Betty C. Delavan, Elizabeth

McDowell, Francena L. Nolan, William R. Shaffer, Beth K. Wham; **Pennsylvania State College (Swarthmore)**, Edward Fishman; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (East Stroudsburg)**, Katherine B. McFarland, Francis B. McGarry, Jonas T. May; **University of Pennsylvania**, G. Malcom Laws, Jr., Donald W. Sanville; **University of the Philippines**, Herbert G. Haljaspol; **Phoenix College**, Sam L. Bobo; **University of Pittsburgh**, A. David Lazovik; **Pomona College**, Louis B. Perry; **Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Robert B. Jefferson; **Princeton University**, Gustave M. Gilbert, Joseph G. Phelan, Lyman Spitzer, Jr., Christof Wegelin; **Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico**, Laura G. Bover, Erskine McKinley, Ismael Vélez; **College of Puget Sound**, Murray Morgan, D. Robert Smith, Norman F. Washburne; **Purdue University**, A. Earl Bell, Edward M. Bennett, Robert H. Hawkins, Ray C. Maize.

Queens College (New York), Evelyn Steele.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Roberta D. Cornelius; **Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute**, Arthur L. Levy; **University of Richmond**, Perry C. Holt; **Roosevelt College**, Donald C. Baum, Bernard Greenberg, Martha Silvius.

St. Francis College (Pennsylvania), Jack M. Grant; **St. John's University**, C. Gordon Higgins, Frank J. Kreysa; **St. Louis University**, Kenneth H. Adams, Joseph J. Conradi; **St. Michael's College**, Otto C. Kohler, Charles A. McIsaac, Andrew Woloszyn; **College of St. Thomas**, Robert L. Probst; **St. Vincent College**, John J. L. Johnson, Thomas F. Jordan, Daniel P. Nolan, George J. Zvirblis; **Sacramento College**, George W. Creel; **Salem College**, Elizabeth Welch; **City College of San Francisco**, Leah Levikow, Samuel B. Ziegler; **San Francisco State College**, Jean Blackman; **San Jose State College**, Eleanor Coombe, Mary H. Hooton, Bert M. Morris, Louise Shoup, Mary S. Wiley, Ethel E. Wright; **University of Scranton**, Charles J. Buckley; **Seton Hall College**, James F. Liebke; **Shorter College**, Virginia Boney; **Simmons College**, Waldo E. Palmer; **Simpson College**, Delber L. McKee, Chester A. Morgan; **Medical College of the State of South Carolina**, Bernard Metz; **State Colored Normal, Industrial, Agricultural and Mechanical College of South Carolina**, J. Wilson Cutliff; **University of South Carolina**, Joseph W. Everett, Jr., Olin S. Pugh, William B. Woodward; **University of Southern California**, Jack Flasher, Paul R. Saunders; **Southern Methodist University**, Laurence Perrine; **Southern University**, Eugene McGowan, Jesse L. Murray; **Southwestern State College**, Glenn R. Snider; **Stout Institute**, Ray C. Johnson, C. Harrison Parmer, Lloyd Whydotski; **Sul Ross State Teachers College**, A. N. Foster; **Syracuse University**, Ethel Albert, Irwin Harvey, Otway Pardee; **Syracuse University (Utica College)**, Raymond Simon.

Temple University, Ingrid Hahne, Gilbert M. Hill; **East Tennessee State College**, Ella V. Ross; **University of Tennessee**, Laurence R. Fitzgerald; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, John J. Bryan, David E. Carlson; **Texas College of Arts and Industries**, Frank H. Kelly; **Texas State College for Women**, Casse P. Dickinson, Eva H. Mark; **East Texas State Teachers**

College, Wallace J. Bonk; **Texas State University for Negroes**, James Vinson; **University of Texas**, Olin E. Hinkle, Arthur Ruskin, Paul E. Tullar; **University of Toledo**, Alice Rosler; **Tufts College**, Robert M. Kozelka; **Tulane University**, Dorrian Apple, Carl H. Hamburg.

Union College (Kentucky), Joseph R. Henderson; **Utah State Agricultural College**, William F. Sigler; **University of Utah**, Charles H. Anderson.

Vassar College, John W. Streeter; **Villanova College**, Joseph B. Conway, Louis A. Donaghue, Francis J. Donohue, Robert P. Koob, James R. McCormick, Peter F. Mento, Donald A. Nienstedt, John J. Patton, John T. Queenan; **Virginia State College**, William S. Cooper, Timothy R. Wells, R. Finley Wood; **University of Virginia (Mary Washington College)**, Mary E. Stephenson.

Washington College, David D. Bates, A. Bascom Hardcastle, W. Stanley Krisher, Ralph R. Thornton, Charles H. Voelker, H. Linwood Yager; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Celia B. Allen, Wilfred Beard, Jane Patterson; **State College of Washington**, Frank G. Anderson, John B. Edlefsen, Edward Gross, George A. Medley; **Washington University**, Leonard Berkowitz, Franklin Haimo, George E. Pake; **University of Washington**, Joseph A. Cavanaugh, Edmund E. Dudek, Frank L. Parks, Aubrey Wendling; **Wayne University**, Mead W. Killion; **Western Reserve University**, John A. Cassidy, R. Maxine Pattison Jones, Ernest Yeager; **Westminster College (Pennsylvania)**, Donald G. Hartman, Donald E. Lathrope; **Whittier College**, Robert P. Kraft, Margaretha Lohmann, Gerald R. Patton, Eugene M. Riddle; **Whitworth College**, Homer E. Alder, Thomas W. Bibb; **Municipal University of Wichita**, Carl E. Ortmeier, William D. Tuxbury; **College of William and Mary**, Theodore M. Moore; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee)**, Earl M. Grotke; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls)**, Virginia Akins, Carleton C. Ames, Nathalie Delander, Carrie Dorsey, Ann Dubbe, Robert C. Fisler, Marion E. Hawkins, Joseph T. Hoy, Glen P. Junkman, Rudolph A. Karges, Opal A. Knox, Berger S. Kolberg, Louis A. Kollmeyer, Bernard L. McCarthy, John M. May, John G. Mosher, Jr., George K. Schlagenhauf, Oscar W. Sjowall, Thorvald E. Thoreson, Edward Urbanich, Melvin L. Wall; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (Whitewater)**, John A. Heide; **Wittenberg College**, William Coyle, Claude E. Dierolf, Karl G. Lind.

Yale University, George Nordmeyer, Rollin G. Osterweis.

Junior

University of Alabama, W. U. McDonald; **University of Cincinnati**, Lorean A. Pirrung; **Drake University**, Carol M. Goodwin; **University of Minnesota**, Arthur W. Rudnick, Jr., **Pennsylvania State College**, Paul G. Andrews; **University of Virginia**, James E. Kinard; **Not in Accredited Institutional Connection**, E. Vera Idol (M.A., Columbia University), High Point, North Carolina; Robert L. Scribner (Ph.D., University of Virginia), Oglethorpe, Georgia; Abraham B. Shoulson (Graduate work, Yeshiva University), Erie, Pennsylvania.

Elections to Membership

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election to membership in the Association of 1225 Active and 25 Junior Members, as follows:

Active

Adelphi College, Irene J. Abelow, M. Esther Bloss, August F. Cantfil, Mary Jane Cook, Frida M. Frischauer, J. Edward Hayden, John F. Storr, Margaret White; **University of Akron**, Alice A. Kauffman, Raymond J. Nelson; **Alabama Agriculture and Mechanical College**, Richard D. Morrison; **Alabama Polytechnic Institute**, Basil Cimino, Gabriel Guevrekian, Joe Peterson, Sidney Lee Thompson; **Alabama State Teachers College (Florence)**, William J. McIlrath; **Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville)**, Mary F. Edwards, Harvey J. Wilson; **University of Alabama**, Herbert A. Sawyer; **Albion College**, David L. Strickler; **Albright College**, Ellery B. Haskell, John W. Khouri; **Alfred University**, Leon B. Bassett, Wayne Brownell, H. O. Burdick, Marion L. Fosdick, John Freund, Thomas A. Hall, W. Varick Nevins III, Willis C. Russell, Lelia E. Tupper, Rae Whitney; **American International College**, Ethel Cosmos, Ephraim Fischhoff, Robert L. Hemond, Mary B. O'Connell, Alice R. Robinson, J. Clyde Sumsion, Charles A. Wells, Kenneth Zimmer; **American University**, David J. Brandenburg; **Amherst College**, James Eells, Jr.; **Antioch College**, C. Vernon Cannon; **Arizona State College (Flagstaff)**, J. Alfred Anderson, William H. Harris; **Arizona State College (Tempe)**, Everett R. Shaw; **University of Arizona**, Deonisie Trifan; **University of Arkansas**, Robert M. Soldofsky; **University of Arkansas (Little Rock)**, James S. Dinning, Barbara Kelley.

Baldwin-Wallace College, Ralph K. Davies; **Barat College**, Grace M. Jaffe, Jean E. Saurwein; **Bates College**, John R. Willis; **Baylor University**, Sarah L. Henry, Mary E. Norvell; **Bennington College**, Paul Matthen; **Berea College**, Jean M. Wyre; **Blackburn College**, Marion M. Wolcott; **Boston College**, William B. Hickey; **Boston University**, Kingsbury Badger, Robert K. Brandriff, Arthur M. Griffing, Philip S. Haring, Felix C. Maidana, John P. Mallan, Elinore B. Trowbridge, Richard M. Verrill; **Bowdoin College**, Raymond A. Bournique, E. Parker Johnson, Perley S. Turner; **Bowling Green State University**, Warren S. Allen; **University of Bridgeport**, Leo I. Burrington, Michael W. Macek; **University of British Columbia**, Ralph D. James; **Brooklyn College**, Harry Bernstein, Feliks Gross, Edward O. Lutz, Carleton Washeburne, Arthur D. Zinberg; **Brown University**, E. Burrows Smith; **University of Buffalo**, Donald H. Bullock, Robert D. Gordon, John P. Henderson, Lysander Kemp, Thomas W. Kennelly, Dora W. Osborn, Ford R. Park, Jr., Janet C. Potter, Nathan Shenfeld.

California Institute of Technology, Charles E. Bures; **California State Polytechnic College**, Ralph W. Dilts, Frederick M. Essig, Henry E. Gray, James A. McInerny, Glenn A. Noble, David H. Thomson; **University of California**,

Edward L. Barrett, Jr., Howard A. Bern, Shih-hsiang Chen, Leland E. Cunningham, Gordon Griffiths, Lawrence Grossman, Sears R. Jayne, Richard W. Jennings, Norman S. Waner, **University of California (Los Angeles)**, E. Clinton Adams, Joseph B. Birdsell, Alan E. Flanigan, John S. Helmick, George H. Hildebrand, Donald S. Howard, Kenneth Macgowan, Jessie Rhulman, Margaret Robertson, Henry Schnitzler; **University of California (Santa Barbara)**, Elsie A. Pond; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Paul Saunders; **Case Institute of Technology**, Salvatore Cicirello, Leslie L. Foldy, Parry Keller, Jr., Aaron L. Nelson, James E. Rice, Richard M. Robinson; **Catawba College**, Betty Barbour, Reid Jann; **Catholic University of America**, Carlette Engel de Janosi; **Cedar Crest College**, Clayton H. Chapman, Helene-Edith Frey, Lewellyn J. Moss, Mildred L. Russell, Walter E. Wiest; **Central College (Missouri)**, Meredith G. Eller; **Chapman College**, John Browning, Richard Goolian, James W. Utter, Jr., Gwen R. Waters; **College of Charleston**, Henry Miller, Jr.; **University of Chattanooga**, Durwood C. Harvey; **Chicago City Junior College (Wright Branch)**, Kostis T. Argoe, Franklin R. Lindquist; **University of Chicago**, Carlos Castillo, J. Carson McGuire, Harvey S. Perloff, Daniel D. Williams; **University of Cincinnati**, Rachel Bergman, Walter S. Houston, Clair E. Hubert, Robert A. Mace, James M. Vail; **The City College (New York)**, Bernard W. Aginsky, Warren G. Brown, William K. C. Chen, John W. Collier, Alfred P. Parsell, Thomas A. Spitz, Morris Swadesh, Sam Winograd; **Clark College (Washington)**, Ruth Orndorff; **Clark University**, John H. Blair; **Clemson Agricultural College**, John Goodman; **Colby College**, Charles N. Bacon, Philip S. Bither, Alice P. Comparetti, Ermanno F. Comparetti; **Colgate University**, Edwin Downie, John M. Longyear III; **Colorado College**, Alvin Foote; **University of Colorado**, Margaret A. Blythin, Curtis W. Martin, Joseph D. Park; **Columbia University**, Robert E. Cosgrove, Nathan Edelman, Otis E. Fellows, André von Gronicka, Willis E. Lamb, Jr., Robert S. Lynd, Herbert W. Schneider, Werner Sewald, William S. Vickrey; **Concord College**, Kathryn Whittaker; **Connecticut College**, Maria Kosko, Bernice Wheeler; **Teachers College of Connecticut**, Ulysses E. Whiteis; **University of Connecticut**, Judith Holman, Violet T. Schroeder; **Cornell University**, Arthur H. Bernstein, Cheng-Yang Hsu, Bert Lear, Mary Marquardt, Harold E. Moore, Jr.

Dartmouth College, Francois Denoeu, Francisco Ugarte; **Del Mar College**, William M. Hager; **De Paul University**, William R. Crowley, Paul Daily, Armin Grams, Kenneth K. Henning, Earl G. Whipple, Thomas J. Wynn; **Dickinson College**, John S. Steckbeck; **Drake University**, Lewis E. Caswell, Gerald K. Chinn; **Duquesne University**, Paul R. Betz, Reyes Carbonell, R. Gordon Dippel, Tage U. H. Ellinger, Virginia D. McCullough, George McFadden, Frank P. Numer, Patrick M. O'Donnell III, George A. Robertson, Jr., John R. Schlicht, John T. Stratton, H. Harry Szmant.

Emory University, Lynwood M. Holland; **Eureka College**, Leonard W. H. Charnock, Oran V. Myers.

Fenn College, Robert B. Auld, Samuel H. Berwald, Lloyd C. Billings, Vance Chamberlin, William Cherubini, Randle E. Dahl, George H. Faust,

John A. Froebe, V. Richard Gulbenkian, Virgil D. Hales, Millard L. Jordan, C. Virginia Kiel, John G. McGrew, John W. McNeill, John C. Matthews, William F. Moore, Jr., Chester W. Topp, Donald R. Tuttle, Karl H. Van D'Elden; **Fisk University**, Ferdinand Gowa; **Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes**, James Hudson; **Florida Southern College**, Ambolena H. Robillard; **Florida State University**, Waymah B. Barber, Clarence F. Blake, Howard G. Danford, Edward Eikman, Herman Gunter, Jr., Dorothy L. Hoffman, Dean Johnson, Richard H. Jordan, Carl Keul, Russell C. Kirkpatrick, H. Rowland Ludden, Robert J. Massey, Glen E. Murphy, James Preu, Wallace W. Reichelt, William H. Rogers, Vivian B. Schneiderman, Robert N. Sedore, Lyman D. Toulmin, Lucile Wagner, Kenneth L. Yudowitch; **University of Florida**, Russell E. Bagley, Robert G. Blake, William A. Fullagar, Warren E. Green, James C. Morelock, Charles E. Reid, Merrill J. Roberts, Paul Tarrant; **Franklin College of Indiana**, Margaret A. Sparling; **Fresno State College**, Forrest D. Brown; **Furman University**, Robert N. Daniel, Jules A. Medwin, Lewis C. Vinson.

George Washington University, Charles E. Bish, Jacqueline C. Buhrman, Robert M. Cooper, Muriel H. McClanahan, William F. Sager, William L. Turner; **George Williams College**, Sylvanus M. Duvall; **Georgia Institute of Technology**, J. C. Horton Burch, M. J. Goglia, Martin L. Gursky, Chandler H. Holton, August Kadow, Jr., Frank A. Kopf, Isaac E. Saporta; **Georgia State Woman's College**, Margaret Deavor, William M. Gabard; **University of Georgia**, Ruth Sane; **University of Georgia (Atlanta Division)**, James E. Routh; **Gustavus Adolphus College**, James S. Douglas, Mary A. Ericson, Margaret Ermarth, Lucy D. Fryxell, Nels P. Langsjoen, Marvin Larson.

Hahnemann Medical College, Albert Lupton; **Hanover College**, Arthur R. Porter, Jr., Walter L. Stone; **Harvard University**, Richard D. Ellmann; **Haverford College**, Marcel M. Gutwirth; **Hillyer College**, Edward F. Humphrey, Kurt Weinberg; **Hofstra College**, Edward C. Sampson; **University of Houston**, A. A. White; **Hunter College**, Ethel G. Aginsky, Dorothy B. Ball, Hannah Holzman, Elaine F. Howard, Rose S. Kiesler, Herbert N. Otis, Doris L. Trepel.

Idaho State College, Donald Lundberg; **University of Idaho**, Edward A. Cebull; **Illinois College**, Joachim A. Stenzel; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, George E. Danforth, W. Grant Ireson; **Eastern Illinois State College**, Helen L. Devinney; **Western Illinois State College**, Kathleen J. Brophy; **Illinois State Normal University**, Edna I. Kelley, Winifred S. Metzler, Genevieve A. Pohle; **Northern Illinois State Teachers College**, Bernadine C. Hanby; **University of Illinois**, Eva F. Benton, Emerson Cammack, Mary L. Chase, Thelma Eaton, Marian Harman, R. P. Oliver, Edward L. Phillips, Chester G. Starr, Jr., Eugene Weigel; **University of Illinois (Navy Pier)**, Martha H. Mackin; **Indiana Central College**, John L. Gehr, John E. Hill, Leo S. Miller, William G. Miller, Archie G. Mullins, Richard D. Rowley, Allan F. Schirmer, Kenneth J. Sidebottom, Eugene T. Underwood; **Indiana State Teachers College**, Merle S. Brown, Gertrude Ewing, Bertha W. Fitzsimmons, Wenonah Goshorn, Beulah V. Hartman, Florise Hunsucker, Caroline S. Kelso, Kathryn M.

Kennedy, Inez L. Mauck, Mary Helen Price, Edward I. Reasor; **Indiana University**, William M. Barr, William S. Gustin, Victor W. Koepsell, Arthur Schweitzer; **Iowa State College**, Lionel K. Arnold, I. W. Arthur, Harriet L. Berger, W. Chester Fitch, Virgil Salera; **Iowa State Teachers College**, James T. Blanford, Henry Harris, Emma Opfer, Herbert K. Tjossem, Robert H. Weber; **Iowa Wesleyan College**, S. Carl Fracassini, J. Roland Palangio, Jane H. Palangio, Harry L. Wilkey.

John B. Stetson University, Janie W. Goolsby, Lemuel A. Haslup; **Johns Hopkins University**, John De Francis, Vincent G. Dethier, Bruce W. Ward-ropper.

Fort Hays Kansas State College, F. W. Albertson, Edward C. Almquist, Ralph V. Coder, Gaynelle Davis, Naomi Garner, Samuel M. Hamilton, Leland E. Heinze, Leon W. Hepner, Geneva Herndon, Ralph Huffman, Harlan B. Johnson, Jack W. Juergens, Harriet Ketchum, Lawrence B. Lee, Rosella McCarrroll, Robert P. Marple, Edwin P. Martin, W. D. Moreland, Ila Newbecker, Charles C. Onion, Verna Parish, Kathryn S. Riddle, Jack W. Rodgers, Lester J. Schmutz, Cade Suran, Fred Unruh; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, Rolland A. Alterman; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Eugene Larkin; **University of Kansas**, Leland S. Bohl, Kenneth E. Coombs, Anni W. Frankl, Joseph C. McGoughran, Jackson O. Powell, Otho M. Rasmussen, William R. Terrell; **University of Kansas City**, Charles T. Daniel, Royal C. Gilkey, Anna H. Koffler, Lawrence W. Kuhl, Loren E. Morey, John Newfield; **Kent State University**, Caro M. Carapetyan, Jeanne Gilbert-Ver Heyden, Ralph S. Kaczor, Earl Kelly, James MacCampbell, Verna F. Walters, Henry N. Whitney; **Kentucky State College**, Robert L. Jack, Rutha W. Jack; **Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College**, Fred A. Engle, Dean Gatwood, William B. Hopp, Margaret H. Morberly, Horace W. Raper, Blanche Seevers, James W. Stocker, Thomas Stone, Gladys P. Tyng; **University of Kentucky**, Ward W. Bauder, James S. Brown, Edward B. Hornowski; **Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery**, James A. Keller, Wallace M. Pearson.

LaGrange College, Lottie M. Peirce; **Langston University**, William H. Martin, Akiki K. Nyabongo; **LaSalle College**, Charles F. Smith; **Lewis and Clark College**, Ruth P. Chindgren, Reinhard G. Pauly, Alice F. Wieman; **Limestone College**, Mary P. Glenn; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, Irma Leathers, Arthur E. Pullman, Jr.; **Southeastern Louisiana College**, Howard W. Kidd, Elmer E. Puls; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, H. Waldo Wasson; **Louisiana Polytechnic Institute**, Francis O. Adam, Jr., Robert E. Emmer, Winnie D. Evans, Lawrence J. Fox, Lester M. Garrison, Wallace Herbert, Fairy C. McBride, William L. Mitchell, Robert W. Mondy, Richard M. Pullig, M. Louise Smith, W. Benson Temple; **Louisiana State University**, William F. Beyer, Jr., Lindsay S. Olive, Minns S. Robertson; **Loyola University (Louisiana)**, Victor H. Baker; **Luther College**, Frederic A. Giere; **Lynchburg College**, Bronislaw E. Matecki.

Macalester College, Vincent W. Carpenter, Lenore Erik-Alt, A. Elizabeth Leinbach, Julius Lichtenstein, Jack Patnode, William A. Swain, David White; **University of Maine**, Joyce C. Stevens, David W. Trafford, Robert M. York;

Manhattan College, Thomas J. Durkin, Jr.; **Marietta College**, Warren Bruner; **Marquette University**, Kevin B. Herbert; **Marshall College**, Ralph M. Edeburn, Dorothy A. Fisher, Florence Thomas; **University of Maryland**, James F. Condell, Mary L. de Give; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, Charles D. Coryell; **Massachusetts State Teachers College (Framingham)**, Miriam A. Riley, Bernice W. Taylor; **University of Massachusetts**, Lawrence M. Bartlett, William Haller, Jr., Jay H. Korson, Theodore T. Kozlowski, Ames S. Pierce, Frank P. Rand, Floriana Tarantino, H. Leland Varley; **University of Massachusetts (Ft. Devens)**, Solomon H. Gordon; **Meharry Medical College**, Georgia L. Rutland; **Memphis State College**, Calvin M. Street, Joseph R. Taylor, Alma Whitaker; **Mercyhurst College**, John A. Donatelli; **Meredith College**, Clyde N. Parker; **University of Miami**, Forrest E. Adams, C. Edward Anderson, José A. Balseiro, Clayton C. Campbell, C. R. Crabbe, Marinus J. Dijkman, Richard A. Hausler, Milton Kelner, Richard D. Kreske, William J. Lee, Elizabeth H. Marsden; **Northern Michigan College of Education**, Albin E. Fritz; **Western Michigan College of Education**, Leonard C. Kercher; **Michigan State College**, Ralph W. Lewis, Henry A. Stoehr; **Michigan State Normal College**, Carl Hood; **University of Michigan**, Joseph F. Albano, Philip C. Davis, Carl H. Fischer, Robert S. Redmount, Ralph G. Stanton, Morgan Thomas; **Middlebury College**, Leo M. King; **Millsaps College**, Albert F. Sanders; **Minnesota State Teachers College (St. Cloud)**, Arthur F. Nelson; **University of Minnesota**, David V. Erdman, Gerald Feese, Paul Fetler, Rodolfo O. Floripe, Earl R. George, Cyril J. Hoyt, Thelma E. Hunter, William P. Jensen, Blanche Kendall, Gisela Konopka, Mary Malcolm, Douglas G. Marshall, Margarita W. Mills, Andreas G. Papandreou, William H. Rodgers, William Schofield, William G. Shepherd, Anne S. Winslow; **University of Minnesota (Duluth Branch)**, Chester W. Wood; **Mississippi State College**, William S. Anderson, J. L. Anthony, Ferris S. Batson, Hugh W. Bennett, William E. Christian, Jr., Roland Cowart, Bascom K. Doyle, Robert C. Eckhardt, J. B. Edmond, Felix E. Edwards, Morris D. Finkner, James P. Gaines, L. E. Gholston, William R. Glover, Monica Goen, G. D. Green, C. Dale Hoover, William C. Howell, Ulysses S. Jones, Marion Kelley, Emmett A. Kimbrough, Jr., John W. Lusk, Preston H. McDonald, John C. McWhorter, Spencer B. Murray, Jean P. Overcash, Carlton H. Ragland, John C. Redman, Edward G. Roberts, David J. Savage, Henry J. Smith, A. D. Suttle, Harvey B. Vanderford, Robert B. Watson, George B. Welch, Darrell G. Wells, Helen C. White; **University of Mississippi**, Gerald Forbes; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Melville B. Evans; **Northeast Missouri State Teachers College**, Eugene W. Smith; **University of Missouri**, Vladimir E. Hartman, Charles E. Vogan; **Missouri Valley College**, Evelyn E. Powell; **Monmouth College**, C. Donald Vogel; **Montana State College**, Joseph C. Osborn; **Montana State University**, James R. Anthony, William H. Coldiron, Lois D. Cole, Hasmig G. Gedickian, Earl C. Lory, George Perkins, Bernice B. Ramskill; **Morgan State College**, Winfred O. Bryson, Jr., Rosalyn O. Furlonge, Maurice A. Lee, Lawrence H. Middleton; **Morningside College**, Ray O. Burks, Jr., Hans Lampl; **Mount Holyoke College**, Grace E. Perkinson; **Muhlenberg**

College, A. Eric Bubeck, Charles A. Hollister, Perry F. Kendig, Robert E. Lorish; **Multnomah College**, Helen H. Douglas; **Muskingum College**, W. Hughes Barnes.

National College of Education, Gwendolyn Addenbrooke, Helen Challand, Marjorie Hunter, Louise Neusbaum; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, Arthur J. Looby; **University of Nebraska**, E. H. Beckmann, Josephine E. Brooks, Julius H. Cahn, John F. Davidson, Darrell D. Deane, Curtis M. Elliott, Anne Harder, Joseph V. Harmon, Jr., W. T. Lenser, Ruth F. McNaughton, William L. Messmer, Katherine Nash, Lois Natanson, Leonard Nelson, Darrel J. Peters, Carol E. Puckett, Elizabeth Quinton, David W. Seyler, Elien Shively, Adam S. Skapski, Paul R. Stewart, Merle A. Stoneman, Arther S. Trace, Maxine Trauernicht, Alma Wagner, Jessie A. Warden, John C. Whaley, Ramey C. Whitney; **University of New Hampshire**, Howard S. Bretsch, Alice P. Foster; **New Jersey State Teachers College (Trenton)**, Mary V. Gaver; **New Mexico State College**, Mildred A. Barrett, Chester H. Linscheid; **New Mexico State Teachers College**, Leonora Sherman; **University of New Mexico**, David T. Benedetti, Rubén Cobos, John Dunbar, Dexter H. Reynolds, Robert F. Utter; **New York State Teachers College (Cortland)**, Ralph A. Brown, Cranston H. Jordan, Wava T. McGrath, Walter E. Mulholland, H. Kenyon Stell, Gustave B. Timmel; **New York State Teachers College (Fredonia)**, Frederick Ambellan, Isabel J. Bond, Vivian M. Robe; **New York State Teachers College (Geneseo)**, Hazelle Berkness, Dorothy M. Cleveland, Bruce K. Moore; **New York State Teachers College (Oswego)**, William S. Chiverton, Alvar H. Jacobson, Rocco E. Lorusso; **New York University**, Edward L. Anderson, Arthur Z. Arnold, Morley Ayearst, J. Darrell Barnard, Charles E. Barrett, Jr., Ruth G. Batchelor, Lauretta Bender, Ethel T. Bendixen, Louis L. Bergmann, J. Lewis Blass, Max Bogart, Roswell S. Britton, Lucinda N. Bukeley, Louis R. Burman, Lionel Casson, R. Anthony Castagnaro, Austin H. Church, David H. Colin, Richard Courant, William T. Dean, Jr., Martin B. Dworkis, William F. Ehret, Robert S. Emerson, Amy M. Erickson, Kurt O. Friedrichs, Vera S. Fry, John F. Glaser, Wallace Gobezt, Abraham Goldstein, Sanford D. Gordon, Charles Gottlieb, William M. Greenhut, Pinckney J. Harman, Jules M. Hoffman, Albert Hofstadter, Milton Hollins, Ralph E. Hone, Rod W. Horton, Lawrence E. Howard, Milton Hyman, Merritt B. Jones, Lillian W. Kay, Leona M. Kerstetter, Harold R. Klein, Robert B. Kramer, Madeline S. Levine, Joseph D. Mandel, Michael Mastro Simone, David Mayer, Samuel C. Miller, John H. Mulholland, Rita W. Nealon, A. M. Nielsen, John P. Nielsen, Julius N. Obin, Ernest Parkes, Maryann Peins, Joseph Pick, Elliott Polansky, Paul W. Proctor, Durward Pruden, William T. Putney, Jr., James A. Rawley, John G. Rockwell, William Rosenbaum, Maurice J. Saklad, Emanuel A. Salma, John C. Schoonmaker, Leonard K. Schreiber, Helen K. Seiden, Paul M. Sheldon, Andrew W. Shook, Sidney Sorrin, Jesse D. Stark, James S. Stewart, Hans-Lukas Teuber, Robert L. Thompson, Sidney Towne, Atwood H. Townsend, Richard Turner, Ethel Tyrrell, S. Woodrow Van Court, Jeannette Veatch, Martin Weinberger, Charlotte B. Winsor, George J. Witkin, Robert L. Workman; **Agricultural and Technical**

College of North Carolina, Herman Brown; **North Carolina College at Durham**, Virginia A. Brooks, Floyd H. Brown, Rose B. Browne, Owen P. Cooke, Victoria C. Davis, Helen G. Edmonds, Clarence R. Elam, Mamie Elam, W. B. Fletcher, Stewart B. Fulbright, Esther P. Henry, Irma K. Johnson, Edith Lamarre, Omeda R. Livingston, Evelyn F. Luckey, Irving A. McCollum, John B. McLendon, Brooklyn T. McMillon, William Malone, Isham G. Newton, Pauline Newton, Earl W. Phillips, Evelyn B. Pope, Benjamin F. Smith, James T. Taylor, Daniel A. Williams; **University of North Carolina**, Susan G. Akers, James C. Andrews, William J. Daniel, G. Gordon Ellis, Fletcher M. Green, Clifton L. Hall, Samuel M. Holton, Sydney Lester, John V. Myers, Elaine von Oesen, Alton G. Sadler, Stuart W. Sechriest, Joseph W. Straley, John J. Wright, Paul Young; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, Josefina Escajeda; **North Central College**, Walter K. Klass, Paul Schach; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Carl H. Schmidt, William Wiidakas; **North Dakota State Teachers College (Valley City)**, Vera E. Bolinger, Henriette L. Brudos, Susan McCoy, Ina C. Robertson; **University of North Dakota**, J. Walter Cobb, Philip B. Cory; **Northwestern University**, Deming B. Brown, Franklyn S. Haiman, Charles Hall.

Oberlin College, Richard M. Murphy; **Occidental College**, Kenneth Kurtz; **Ohio State University**, Eleanor Anawalt, David Bakan, Robert H. Bremner, Erika Eichhorn, Elijah J. Gordon, Charles D. Hendley, John H. Herrick, Aurèle LaRocque, Louis Nemzer, Manny N. Schor, David Spitz, Ralph W. Stacy, Eugene Vasilew, Delos D. Wickens; **Ohio University**, Donald W. Krimel, William H. Olpp; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Clifford O. Berg; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Malcolm Correll, Abraham Eisenstark; **University of Oklahoma**, Harley P. Brown, Ruben Landa, Edwin C. McReynolds, J. Ralph Reed; **Olympic Junior College**, Harry E. Peterson; **Oregon State College**, Oliver H. Heintzelman, Richard M. Highsmith, Jr., Willard L. Shelton; **University of Oregon**, Paul E. Eiserer, Roderick G. Langston.

Pennsylvania College for Women, T. Carl Whitmer; **Pennsylvania State College**, Helen Adolf, Ralph E. Armington, Arnold W. Asman, Esther A. Atkinson, Stephen J. Bilo, Richard M. Bower, Thomas D. Bowman, Clarence S. Bryner, Beckford F. Coon, R. L. Cowan, Harry M. Crain, Hugh M. Davison, Ray B. Duggins, Otis D. Duncan, George M. Dusenberre, Raymond S. Farwell, Jr., A. H. Forbes, Abram J. Foster, John A. Fox, Cyrus E. French, William H. Gordon, Jr., Harry M. Hochreiter, Jr., Ruth R. Honey, Marguerite E. Horn, Robert H. Ingram, Melvin W. Isenberg, Frank A. Joy, Thomas C. Kavanagh, Amy M. J. Kerstetter, Georg E. Knausenberger, Russell E. Larson, Winton Laubach, A. Roberts Leisner, John E. Linde, George M. Lott, Joseph J. Lowden, Robert H. McCormick, Leslie G. McCracken, Jr., Agnes R. McElwee, Donald A. McGarey, James H. Moyer, Roland E. Mueser, George E. Murphy, R. Russell Murphy, Raymond C. Murphy, Jr., Glenn L. Musser, Vernon W. Myers, Margaret A. Neuber, Charles J. Noll, Martin L. Odland, Elwood F. Olver, Robert B. Patrick, Frances B. Pearson, Andrew J. Pepper, Roy B. Power, Jr., Richard G. Praeger, Alfred O. Rasmussen, Elbert B. Rey-

nolds, Jr., Russell A. Rusk, Dorothy B. Scott, Paul B. Sebring, Charles J. Smith, Cyril B. Smith, Kendon R. Smith, Walter C. Snow, William Spackman, Jr., Jerome Steffens, J. Kenneth Stern, Robert E. Stiemke, Harold I. Tarpley, Charles A. Thomas, Edward G. Thurston, Charles H. Tindal, Richard C. Vincent, Carl Volz, Marshall J. Walker, Harold V. Walton, Gertrude Weaver, Benjamin A. Whisler, Delpha E. Wiesendanger, Wayne H. Wilson, Wesley P. Winter, Clyde J. R. Witman, Richard W. Wonn; **Pennsylvania State College (Swarthmore Center)**, William W. Ullery; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (East Stroudsburg)**, Donald B. Corson, Elvena Mattson; **University of Pennsylvania**, John R. Abersold, Ray H. Abrams, Ernest Bender, Sculley Bradley, Clarence N. Callender, Bernard F. Cataldo, Arthur B. Gabel, Walter S. Peake, Charles M. Weber, Harvey C. L. Wilson, Jr.; **University of Pittsburgh**, Donn E. Bair, Denton Beal, Howard W. Bradley, Thurlow W. Brand, William Dusenberry, Henry C. Fisher, Dorothy Miller, Max Molyneux, Florence Poole, Oscar J. Reckard, Lester H. Roth, Lois C. Schuette, Helen T. Simons, George M. Stewart, Robert M. Sullivan, Ruth A. Sydney, Robert Zugsmith; **University of Puerto Rico**, Osiris Delgado, Monelisa L. Pérez-Marchand; **College of Puget Sound**, Robert Gardner; **Purdue University**, John S. Karling, Ernest Sheppard.

Queens College (New York), Edmund P. Kurz.

Reed College, Arthur H. Leigh; **Rhode Island State College**, Ray M. Batchelder, Chester W. Houston, Arthur L. Svenson; **Rocky Mountain College**, Roberta R. Anderson, James A. Dawson, Charles L. Smith; **Rollins College**, Eugenie M. Grand; **Rutgers University**, George R. Blake, Ardath W. Burks, Harold E. Clark, Charles C. Cumberland, C. Rexford Davis, Ruth Emery, Clifford D. Firestone, John L. Frederick, Frederic C. Genzmer, Claude Hill, Anders S. Lunde, Paul W. Massing, Richard Schlatter, Milton F. Seiden, Norman L. Stamps, Ulrich P. Strauss, David R. Walters.

St. John's University, Joseph S. Berenson, Robert F. Bonagura, Bernard J. Ficarra; **St. Joseph's College**, William J. Bodkin, Jr., Andrew J. Malahan, Joseph A. Raffaele, Francis J. Vastano; **St. Lawrence University**, Concha Bretón, J. Richard Gilbert; **St. Louis University**, Charles Chapman; **St. Petersburg Junior College**, Anne Nossing; **College of St. Thomas**, Frederic A. Bieter, Mathias J. Gillen, Donald M. Medley, George E. Toman; **Sam Houston State Teachers College**, Arthur W. Angrist, Joseph B. Snodgrass; **San Diego State College**, Janet McGaughey; **City College of San Francisco**, Irene E. Mensing; **San Francisco State College**, S. Joseph DeBrum, Leon Lassers, Margaret L. Leonard; **San Jose State College**, Charles P. Guichard, Alston H. Haggerty, Henry C. Meckel, Dolores F. Spurgeon; **Colleges of the Seneca**, Robert H. Bagley, Charles G. Barton, David Braybrooke, Constance A. Brewer, Richard W. Day, Henry Grattan, Bernice A. Kaplan, Donald S. Labigan, Chauncey F. Minnick, Lois Nellis, Maxine V. Pease, Marguerite Rouchaud, Charles J. Schott, Johann Schulz, George V. Walsh; **Seton Hall College**, Maurice W. LeCalvez; **Simpson College**, Carlton A. Chaffee, Herbert J. Markle, Roberta Riegel; **Skidmore College**, Elizabeth B. Watts; **South Dakota State College**, C. Maynard Fox; **University of Southern California**,

Arthur J. Knodel; **Southern Methodist University**, Alvin J. North; **Southern University**, Jean F. Emmons, Aguinaldo A. Lenoir; **Springfield College**, John L. Steele; **Stanford University**, Donald G. Reuter; **Stephens College**, David A. Brown, Roberta Christie, Leland T. Rodgers; **Superior State College**, Esther M. LaRowe; **Syracuse University**, J. Calvin Callaghan, Margaret Finn, Paul W. Gilbert, Erik Hemmingsen, C. V. Holmberg, Eugene Jagust, Marshall W. Jennison, Robert P. Lett, Clinton M. Osborn, Sidney Sukoening; **Syracuse University (Utica College)**, Morton Asch, Walter J. Bruns, Althea Crilley, Virgil C. Crisafulli, R. Eileen Heinig, Abraham P. Kustoff, J. Howard Richards, Joseph Roberts, Owen Roberts, Mary V. Salamey, Arthur W. Saltzman, Charles E. Samuels, Lester J. Start, Glenn E. Thompson, Henry A. Varhely.

Temple University, John A. Brown, Jr., Katherine Frey, Robert H. Haaken-son, Mary Hamilton, W. Glenn Moss, Morton J. Oppenheimer, David L. Robbins, Romulo R. Soldevilla, Harry L. Weinberg; **University of Tennessee**, John M. Carpenter, Clarence E. Hall, Bascom H. Story; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Jack O. Ashworth, Ernest R. Bulow, Lawrence S. Dillon, Bill C. Moore; **Texas Christian University**, Dan L. Anderson; **North Texas State College**, Gerhard Dorn; **Texas State College for Women**, Mary L. Jackson; **Texas State University for Negroes**, Edgar D. Draper; **Texas Technological College**, William C. Irvin, Grace Wellborn; **University of Texas**, Janice E. Christensen, Erbert W. D'Anton, Howard S. Dye, Phil M. Ferguson, Parker C. Fielder, Charles Holzwarth, Paul Kelpke, John J. Kurtz, Frederic Meyers, Dick S. Payne, Glenn V. Ramsey, Jack A. Scanlan, Karl L. Selig, Howard R. Williams; **University of Toledo**, Robert E. Dillon, Lucille B. Emch, Mary M. Gillham, Walter Gross, Hazel D. G. Petcoff, Harold T. Towe; **Tufts College**, James A. Clarkson, C. Fred Gurnham, Elmer R. Trumbull, Jr.; **Tulane University of Louisiana**, John R. Betts, Robert Hodes; **University of Tulsa**, Ruth Green, Virginia Myers.

Union College (Kentucky), Lester H. Colloms; **Union College and University**, Arthur K. Davis, Hans Hainebach, Edward Marz, Harold C. O'Neal; **Union University**, Rosa D. Rutledge; **United States Naval Academy**, Ivor Wayne; **University of Utah**, Donald K. Barton, Ruth M. Jones, Stanley Mu-laik.

Vanderbilt University, Abbott L. Ferriss, John W. Gustad, **Vassar College**, Edith J. Richards, Susan J. Turner; **Villanova College**, Raymond F. Adams, Francis J. Blanchard, Jr., Albert Borowik, Charles P. Bruderle, Paul J. Ernst, Anthony J. Frayne, Alexander Gero, Martin J. Gillan, Jr., William M. Gorman, Joseph C. Greyson, William C. Hampton, Francis Hendry, James L. Henry, Daniel A. Holland, Joseph T. Jonas, Eugene W. Kiefer, John I. McEnerney, James P. McWilliams, Karel Marecek, James L. Miller, Michael J. O'Donnell, Jose de Pedroso, Miles B. Potter, Bohdan P. Procko, George N. Quam, Joseph W. Ratigan, Henry L. Rofinot, Carmen F. Storti; **Virginia Polytechnic Institute**, Joseph B. Dent, Frank A. Vingiello.

Wabash College, Robert V. Ormes; **Washburn Municipal University**, Terry D. McAdam, Charles I. Sager; **Washington College**, James W. Kerley, Rinaldo C. Simonini, Jr.; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Louise V.

Cash; Washington and Jefferson College, Robert P. Ashley; Washington University, Samuel I. Weissman; University of Washington, Sidney W. Bijou, Allen L. Edwards, Robert L. Kahn, Herman C. H. Meyer, James W. Richeimer, Franz R. Sommerfeld; Wayne University, Chester E. Jorgenson, Gabriel W. Lasker; Wesleyan University, Vincent W. Cochrane, Donald Herzberg, Russell T. Limbach, Arthur Mitchell, James K. Moorhead, J. Alden Nichols; West Virginia State College, Ernest N. Ashley, Jr., Kermit C. King; Western Reserve University, John W. Culver, Joseph H. Friend, Harry R. Gasker, Clarence T. Gilham, Clark C. Livensparger, James B. Whipple; Westminster College (Missouri), Gilbert P. Davis, Horatio A. Mangan; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), Henry W. Calvert; Wheaton College (Massachusetts), August C. Miller, Jr., Anne Rechnitzer; Whittier College, Roberta J. Forsberg; College of William and Mary, Joseph Curtis; Wisconsin State Teachers College (Milwaukee), David D. Malcolm; Wisconsin State Teachers College (River Falls), Esther A. Howard, Phyllis L. Simon; Wisconsin State Teachers College (Whitewater), Hugo E. Lahti; University of Wisconsin, Stanley G. Knight; Wittenberg College, J. Robert Blackburn, Robert E. Hawes, Elmer C. Jurkat, Robert J. McKnight, Otto Reimherr, Frank D. White, John T. Williams.

Yale University, John Rodgers, William M. Walton; Yeshiva University, Philip E. Kraus; Youngstown College, Karl W. Dykema.

Transfers from Junior to Active

University of Connecticut, Gertrude Houser; Cornell College, Warren E. Steinkraus; Florida State University, Dwight B. Goodner; University of Houston, Louis Kestenberg; Iowa State College, Carl E. Langenhop; Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, George P. Freeman; Marietta College, Afife Sayin; Michigan State College, Edward B. Blackman; Ohio University, Philip L. Rizzo; West Virginia Wesleyan College, John M. Vayhinger.

Junior Members

University of Buffalo, Francis J. Wozniak; University of Connecticut, Robert W. Stone; University of Denver, Robert Q. Massaro; Duquesne University, Peter M. Puccetti; Loyola University (Illinois), Paul J. von Ebers; University of Michigan, Arthur W. Forbes, Victor Garwood, Warne C. Holcombe; New York University, John A. Patten, Milton E. Rose; Pennsylvania State College, Willard P. Acheson, William D. Brand, Emlyn B. Davies, Mary A. Lawson, Freda Phillips, Daniel G. Reiber; University of Pennsylvania, Solomon Leon; Princeton University, Edward M. Stack; Colleges of the Seneca, Charles A. Lininger, Jr.; University of Southern California, Donald R. O'Connor; Syracuse University, Joseph V. Totaro; University of Washington, Karl E. Zink; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Roland A. Sorensen (Graduate Student, New York University), Oskaloosa, Iowa; Carl E. Weyland (Graduate Student, University of Pennsylvania), Camden, New Jersey; Hans J. Wolff (Graduate Student, University of Michigan), Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

Letters in reference to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's central office for forwarding to the persons concerned. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1101 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

Bird sanctuary caretaker: Pacific coast state Audubon Society seeks retired college professor who taught a natural science or is acquainted or interested in the purposes of the Society. Essential that man enjoy meeting and mingling with people. Preference for man from Pacific area. Compensation \$10.00 monthly and small house (for man or man and wife) on sanctuary grounds, located in wooded area within limits large city. Applicant should submit biographical data V 1291

English: Stimulating young instructor, with graduate degrees, for high-ranking woman's college in the East. Some teaching experience required. State qualifications and fields of interest. Salary range, \$2100-\$3100 for 9 months. V 1292

Physics: Ph.D. East Coast college offering bachelor's and master's degrees in physics. Salary and rank commensurate with experience. Young man preferred. V 1293

Psychology: Associate Professor or Professor to head strong department. Must have Ph.D. with considerable experience in teaching and research. Salary and rank dependent on training and experience. Address applications to Dean M. C. Old, Hofstra College, Hempstead, Long Island, New York.

Inter-American Fellowships

The United States Office of Education, in cooperation with the Department of State, announces the availability of fellowships to United States graduate students as provided under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations. Two graduate students are exchanged each year between the United States and each of the republics signatory to the Convention. During the next academic year the following countries will probably receive students from the United States: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela.

Qualifications. United States citizenship, a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, the initiation or completion of some graduate study, a satisfactory knowledge of the language of the country to which the student wishes to go, good health, moral character, intellectual ability, and a suitable plan of study or a research topic which has been approved by the student's adviser or supervising professor. Preference to students under 35 years of age and to veterans.

Financial Provisions. Transportation to and from the receiving country is paid by the United States Government. The receiving government pays tuition and a small monthly maintenance allowance. In some cases a small sum is allotted for books and incidental expenses.

Application and Selection. Applications should be made not later than February 15, 1950 to the Division of International Educational Relations, American Republics Section, U. S. Office of Education, Washington 25, D. C. Panels of the names of five students will be submitted by the United States Selection Committee to the participating governments which will choose two students for one-year fellowships.

Teachers Available

Administration, Academic Dean, Biological Science: Bachelor of Pedagogy degree (state teachers college), A.B. (church college), A.M., and Ph.D. (state university). Administrative experience: department head, director of summer teachers college and biological station, college dean (state school—2000 students). Upon the amalgamation of two state schools (1948), this dean chose to prepare for further administrative work by full-time teaching contacts in a large college. Numerous publications. Listed in *Who's Who in Education*, *American Men of Science*, *Who's Who in America*, etc. Good speaker, dynamic personality. Very sympathetic with the common man. Will consider junior college with possibilities. May be released at close of any term up to October, 1950. A 3354

Administration, executive position, Presidency: Ph.D. in economics; teaching land economics at university; 20 years of professional and business activities; extensive financial and legal negotiations; civic and public relations; lecturing; trustee, Art Institute; trustee, Family Welfare Association. Educational background: Latin, Greek, history, agriculture. Member A.A.U.P. Greatly interested in the importance and expansion of liberal arts education. Prefer opportunity at medium-sized liberal arts college, church affiliated college, or agricultural college. A 3355

Agronomy, Soil Management, Plant Industry: Agronomist, 44, married. Ph.D. Distinguished European background, extensive education, wide executive and teaching experience, publications, excellent recommendations and references. Research and/or teaching. A 3356

- Anthropology, Sociology, Human Geography, Oriental History, Religion: Man, 33, single. A.M., working on Ph.D. thesis. 2 years' university teaching. Available January, 1950. A 3357
- Art: Man, 39, married, 3 children. B.S.Ed., Massachusetts School of Art, M.A., Columbia, and additional graduate study and scholarships. 16 years' teaching experience at secondary and college level. Supervising and administrative experience. Veteran officer U.S.N.R. At present assistant professor in Midwestern university. A 3358
- Biology (Zoology, Embryology, Ornithology, Heredity): B.Pd., A.B., A.M., Ph.D. Wide experience as teacher, department head, and director of biological station. Publications, *Who's Who*, etc. Can be released at close of any quarter up to October, 1950. A 3359
- Biology, Zoology: Man, married, 1 child. Ph.D. in Vertebrate Zoology from large eastern university. 9 years of successful teaching experience in comparative and mammalian anatomy, genetics, human physiology, embryology, histology, general zoology, general biology and mammalogy. Research and publications in fields of mammalian anatomy, mammalogy and dipterology. Available for second semester 1949-1950 or later. Excellent recommendations. Desires change to California or far Southwest. A 3360
- Business Administration and Economics: Man. Now head of college of business administration and economics of state institution. Has taught wide range of courses. Listed in *Directory of American Scholars, Who's Who in the West*, etc. Member American Economic Association, American Marketing Association, Society for the Advancement of Management. Desire change of location. A 3361
- Economics, Accounts, Statistics and Mathematics: Englishman, 43. M.A. of the University of Oxford. Formerly Chief Statistician in H.M. Colonial Office, London, formerly Flight Lieutenant, Royal Air Force, immigrated into U. S. for permanent residence in 1947 and now teaching the University System of Georgia; desires appointments for summer vacation 1950 and for academic year 1950-51, preferably in Northeastern state. A 3362
- Economics, Public Finance, Transportation and Public Utilities: Man, 39, married. Ph.D. 7 years' teaching experience; 4 years' federal and state administrative experience; 2 years' business experience. Extensive list of publications. 3 years' travel abroad. Now employed state university. Desires permanent change of location, teaching, and/or engaging in research. Will consider departmental head. Available February or June, 1950. A 3363
- Education, Natural Science: Man, 33, married, 2 children. M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University, Ed.D., New York University. Desires permanent position teaching education and/or science. Vitaly interested in general education and teacher training. 10 years' successful teaching and administrative experience. Publications. Varied experience in guidance and adult education. A 3364
- Education or Social Sciences: Man, married, 3 children. B.Sc., M. Litt., extensive graduate study, research in American history and history of education. Elementary, secondary, and college teaching; 7 years' administrative experience in adult education state-wide. Wide experience in occupations, guidance, counselling; specialist in American history, lecturer, author, 4 years' foreign travel and study. Invites correspondence regarding a position as professor, associate professor, or department head. Available immediately. A 3365
- Engineering—Industrial and Management: 10 years associated with engineers on industrial assignments, besides experienced in cooperative education as promoter, administrator, and teacher. Professional subjects including mathematics, de-

- scriptive geometry, and engineering drawing. Invites correspondence as professor or department head. A 3366
- Engineering (Management, Industrial, and Civil): Registered Professional Engineer (Civil and Industrial). Man, 44, married, children. Member of leading professional societies; listed in *Who's Who in Engineering*. Teaching interests are: human relations; human engineering; engineering administration; city and regional planning; engineering law; contracts and specification writing. Invites correspondence regarding position as professor, department head, or dean of engineering. A 3367
- English: Man, 42, married. Ph.D. 8 years' college teaching. Major field: Victorian. Taught or teaching: Shakespeare; Eighteenth Century; Great Books; Criticism; Modern Drama. Publications: Abstract of thesis; bibliography. Excellent references. Available September, 1950. A 3368
- English: Man retiring from state university would accept part-time teaching in university or college. West or Southwest preferred. Ph.D. Specialties, general survey, Sixteenth Century, Victorian Literature. Has taught other courses. Available in June or fall of 1950. A 3369
- English: Man, 32, married, 1 child. Bachelor, Social Sciences; Ph.D., English, Johns Hopkins. 7½ years' teaching experience. Publications in 18th century English literature and modern American literature. Available summer or fall, 1950. A 3370
- English: Man, 45, single. Ph.D., Cornell. 1 book shortly to be published by a university press. English Literature: Survey, Romantic and Victorian periods, Wordsworth, Arnold; Literary Criticism; Great Books; World Literature. Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Scholarship, Fellowships. Travel. Available in January, 1950. A 3371
- English, Business and Technical: Man, 39, single. A.B., M.A., Ph.D. in 1951 from Canadian university. Specialty report writing and technical composition for engineers. Social studies minor. Remedial English specialist. Many years' teaching experience in 3 Eastern and 1 West Coast university. 10 years in large-business correspondence. Available January or September, 1950. \$4000 minimum. Evening session administration experience. A 3372
- French: Veteran, 32, single. Docteur de l'Université de Paris. 6 years' teaching experience. 4 years officer in various branches of Army Intelligence during the war. At present educational adviser with the U. S. Occupational Forces in Germany. Present salary: \$6000. Salary and rank expected: \$4800, Assistant Professor. Available June, 1950. A 3374
- German: Man, 47, married, Protestant. Ph.D., Eastern university. Over 20 years in USA; bilingual. Books, textbook, articles, reviews. Now chairman of college department, but does not insist on executive position. Special fields: modern drama, classical period, scientific German. A 3375
- German: Man, 48, German-born American citizen. "Security clear," with OSS during the war. Ph.D. and equivalent of M.A. from German university; 10 years' successful teaching at U. S. universities; also holds junior college teaching credential. All courses in German language and literature, including scientific German, drama, and lyrics. Author of plays, verse, and essays. Extended foreign travel; excellent references. A 3376
- German and Humanities: Mature man. Ph.D., magna cum laude. 13 years of teaching experience in American colleges. ASTP. Specialty: veterans' readjustment. Available after June, 1950. Teaches also courses in Comparative Literature. A 3377
- History: Man, 40, married. Ph.D. Phi Beta Kappa. 14 years' experience in college teaching. Author of widely-used college text and articles in leading journals. Specialties: U. S. social and cultural, U. S. diplomatic, recent Ameri-

- can and European. At present associate professor in eastern university; further promotion blocked by existing tenures. Available September, 1950. A 3378
- History: Woman. M.A. (History) with course work completed for Ph.D. (History) in large Midwestern university. Major interest in American history, but have also taught European and English history. Recently completed three semesters of a substitute teaching appointment in highly accredited four-year college. Desire permanent position in a four-year college located in Eastern or Southeastern part of United States. Just returned from three months' travel in Europe. Available February, 1950. A 3379
- History: Man, married, 2 children. Ph.D. Professor in Midwestern college with 14 years' teaching and administrative experience. No possibility for advancement in present position. Would like departmental headship in undergraduate college or professorship in university with opportunity for graduate teaching. Fields: American, Canadian, British, and Far Eastern histories. Have published articles and reviews and am finishing a book. Have done extensive public lecturing. To be included in next edition of *Who's Who in America*, *Who Knows and What* and am already in several educational *Who's Whos*. Available summer or fall, 1950. A 3380
- History and International Relations: Man, married. Ph.D. with 17 years' successful college instructional and administrative experience in South, West, and New England, state and private universities. Degrees from Yale, North Carolina, and Clark Universities. Specialized in history, international relations, Far East, with considerable work in political science. Veteran, work in Naval History. Excellent references. Available now. A 3403
- History and Spanish: Man, 27, married, 1 child. Ph.D., Ohio State University. 3 years' teaching experience, 1 year in college Spanish, 2 years' in history and political science. Phi Alpha Theta, Phi Sigma Iota. Excellent recommendations. Prefer East, Middle West or Southeast. Available fall, 1950. A 3404
- International Education, or Organization: Man. Ph.D., best years, many years experience in the educational field as a college professor and as counsellor, American citizen, special interest in social psychology, four languages, many years of residence abroad, is looking for good opportunity, counsellor, coordinator of programs for foreign students, etc. A 3381
- Languages, Spanish, French, German, Russian; Humanities and Educational Research: Man, married. Ph.D. Numerous publications, travel, study and teaching in U. S., Europe, and Latin America. 20 years' experience in research and teaching undergraduate and graduate classes in languages, literature, linguistics and methodology. Invites correspondence regarding position with possibilities of advancement and opportunity for directing research in the field of inter-American education. Listed in *Who's Who* and *Directory of American Scholars*. Good reason for change. A 3382
- Mathematics: Man, 40, married, 3 children. Ph.D. 14 years of successful college and university teaching and administrative experience. Now head of department in a small college. Interested in a similar position or a place as Academic Dean or Dean of Men. Prefer Western or Middle Western location. A 3383
- Mathematics: Woman. M.A. Teaching experience in high school and college. High school position at present. Desires teaching position in junior college or college. Available spring, summer, or fall terms, 1950. A 3384
- Mathematics: Man, 29, single. B.S., M.A., University of Michigan. Additional graduate work. 3½ years' university teaching experience. Available September, 1950. A 3385
- Mathematics: Man, 39, married. A.B., B.S., M.A. 2 years' graduate study. 15 years' teaching experience. Available February 1, 1950. A 3386

Mathematics: Man in late thirties, married, 2 children. Ph.D. 12 years' teaching experience; has done some research and has administrative experience, but first love is teaching. Now associate professor at good eastern institution. Would like professorship or departmental headship, preferably in Midwest.

A 3387

Mathematics and Administration: Man, 34, married, 2 children, Methodist. Ph.D., 1946. 15 years' experience—7 on secondary level, 8 in college undergraduate and graduate. Desires position as head of department of liberal arts or college of education. Prefers North Central or Middle Atlantic States. Available for September, 1950.

A 3388

Music: Man, married, 2 teen-age children. B.Mus. and M.Mus. Over 20 years as head of music departments in two teachers colleges. Special fields: director of chorus, band and orchestra; teacher of theory, violin, viola, and band instruments. Violin soloist. Brochures on flute and violin technic. Articles on teacher training testing. Compositions, piano sonata, songs, etc. Prefer senior college but will consider any music position which has possibilities.

A 3389

Music: Man, 33, married. B.S., M.A., Ph.D. American, now teaching at large Canadian university (associate professor) wishes to return to teaching in United States. 7 years' experience at university level teaching musicology, composition, history harmony, counterpoint, etc. Instruments, violin and viola. Conducting experience.

A 3390

Philosophy: Man, 45, married, 1 child. Ph.D. Many years of college and university teaching, mostly undergraduate, some graduate. Broad interests; best equipped in modern philosophy and philosophy of science. Several articles, one book. Available September, 1950.

A 3391

Philosophy and/or Psychology: Man, 40, veteran. M.A. and additional graduate study. 10 years' teaching experience. Available immediately.

A 3392

Physiology, Mammalian and General or Cellular, and Pharmacology: Man, Ph.D. Associate professor in medical school with 11 years' teaching experience, primarily in physiology, also in pharmacology. Publications in physiology and pharmacology. Administrative experience in physiology.

A 3393

Political Science and History: Man, 46, married. Ph.D. Excellent record, not only in college teaching and research, but also in business, as a military officer, and as a government executive. Now employed by important research agency, desires return to academic field as professor, with or without the administrative duties of department head, dean, etc. Widely travelled in United States and abroad, practiced speaker, able writer, experienced teacher of American government, international relations, comparative government, diplomatic history. Prefers Pacific Coast location, but would consider East or Mountain States. Available June, 1950 or earlier by special arrangement.

A 3394

Psychology: A.A., B.A., M.A., plus one and one-half years of study beyond the M.A. Experience as Statistician and Social Science Analyst with government agency, two and one-half years' college teaching experience. Have taught general, social, applied, abnormal, and educational psychology. Member of several professional and honorary organizations. Last position: Associate Professor (resigned). Desire position with small or medium sized liberal arts college. Prefer location in southern states or Canada.

A 3395

Psychology: Man, 40, married. Ph.D., Columbia (psychology). Member Sigma Xi, professional societies; listed *American Men of Science*. Substantial and diversified experience in undergraduate field of psychology, minor experience in sociology and logic. Now employed, interested in change to situation presenting greater opportunities for professional growth.

A 3396

Psychology: Man, past 45, widower. B.A., M.A., Ph.D. In present position 13 years. Have taught practically every undergraduate course in psychology.

Have taught courses in industry. Extensive experience counselling with students. Considerable administrative experience as Administrative Head of ESMWT program for 5 years. Director of VA Guidance Center for 3 years. Organized, developed, and continue to serve as Director of Psychological Service Center, nationally certified, serving both student and nonstudent clients. Organized and have been teaching for 6 years a course in adjustment in courtship and marriage. Extensive travel in Europe and the Near East. Willing to consider transfer January 27, 1950, June, 1950, or September, 1950. Reason for change: Advancement.

A 3397

Religion, Philosophy, Counselling: Man, 36, Protestant, wife and 2 children. Th.D. Experienced teacher and church leader, equipped to head department. Now in moderate sized Midwestern state university teaching religion, philosophy, some sociology and humanities, and doing student counselling. Available June, 1950.

A 3398

Romance Linguistics: Romance Linguistics, Comparative Literature and Philology; French, German, Spanish, Italian, Hebrew: Renowned scholar, at present Head of Department Romance Philology at Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Ph.D., Heidelberg. 20 years' experience and research in Germany and Israel, both teaching and direction of scientific studies. Available for position in U. S. college or university. References, credentials and details through Dr. Berthold C. Friedl, P. O. Box 83, University Branch, Miami 46, Florida.

Russian, German and French Languages and Literature: Woman. B.A. and M.A., Ohio State University. Far advanced towards Ph.D. at Columbia. Studied in Germany and in France. Numerous publications. 19 years' teaching experience in the United States and in Europe. Available February, 1950.

A 3399

Social and Abnormal Psychology or Philosophy: Man, married. Ph.D. Many years of experience. Available on short notice.

A 3400

Spanish: Man, Spaniard, 39, married to Spanish wife. Degree from University of Madrid. 4 years' teaching experience in American colleges. Now assistant professor. Publications. Main field, Spanish contemporary literature. Desires position as associate or assistant professor.

A 3401

Speech and Drama, English: Man, 29, married, no children. B.A., M.A., Ph.D. 3 years' college teaching experience. Unique academic and professional background. Extremely well-qualified to teach drama and theatre history, dramatic criticism, motion picture history and criticism, acting and all phases of dramatic production, oral interpretation, writing for radio, advanced composition. Has professional (extra-academic) as well as academic experience in these fields. Superior references. Publications. Seeking college or university appointment in New England, Eastern seaboard, or abroad.

A 3402